A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY.

A

CHRISTIAN APOLOGY

BY

PAUL SCHANZ, D.D., D.PH.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN,

TRANSLATED BY

REV. MICHAEL F. GLANCEY,

INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS IN THE DIOCESE OF BIRMINGHAM,

AND

REV. VICTOR J. SCHOBEL, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AT ST. MARY'S, OSCOTT.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.—THE CHURCH.

FIFTH REVISED EDITION.

Frederick Pustet & Co.

Printers to The Holy Apostolic See and The Sacred
Congregation of Rites

RATISBON ROME NEW YORK CINCINNATI

TRANSLATORS' PREFACE.

I.

This third, and last, volume of Dr. Schanz's Christian Apology deals with the Church. Apart from the inherent importance of its subject, the volume may fairly claim the attentive interest of every English student of Theology, because of its close inward connection with an Apology that not only breaks new ground, but is also the first of its kind, as we believe, in the English language.

The author's manner of treatment is especially commendable for its logical clearness and consistency. His subject is introduced by a preliminary chapter of great importance, and serving as a basis for all that follows, on the Finality of Christian Revelation and the Development of Christian Belief. The Church is the connecting link between Revelation in the abstract and Revelation in the concrete—between vague faith in an undefined cloud of revealed doctrine, and precise belief in a catena of definite truths. In dealing with the Church the author scrupulously adheres to the strict historical method. The Kingdom of God upon earth gradually rises before our eyes in growing distinctness from the first shadowy outline

prophetically thrown upon the history of the past, to the brightness of the perfect plan revealed in its actual completeness. We behold Christ building it up, stone by stone, from its inception in the home of the Holy Family at Nazareth, till its glorious Dedication amid the flashing fires of the Spirit at Pentecost. Pentecost, says the author, witnessed, not its birth, but its crowning and consecration. From a study of this work of Christ we learn the true definition of the Church as a living reality. All along we are dealing with facts. The Church grows out of a real Christ into a real thing. We follow Him with our eyes as He draws men to Himself, filling them with wisdom and grace; moulding, shaping, and subduing their character; absorbing them into His purpose, and assimilating them into one body that lives in the pervading strength of His Spirit. Beneath our gaze the Church arises, and we see projected, as on a plane, her nature and constitution, her office and work, her attributes and power. The new living organisation of the Apostolic college is the Church—it is Christ still living visibly in our midst, with like power and the self-same office. We thus understand what is meant by the Unity, Apostolicity, Catholicity, Infallibility of the Church; and we gain a view of the Church, that is not only true to fact and nature, but is also definite, consistent and harmonious.

In the question of the Church does every

religious controversy centre. Here we are at the parting of the ways. Every reputed Church is either of Christ or of Belial, and we must commit ourselves wholly to one or to the other. It is not lawful "to run after many lovers." Here, if anywhere, does the saying hold in all its force: "Be-"cause thou art luke-warm, and neither cold, nor "hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth." Not to gather with Christ, is to scatter. It is certainly good and useful for a Christian Apologist to deal with particular truths; but all particular questions are simply dwarfed and lose their importance when in presence of the paramount and all momentous question of the true Church. This is the master-point from which alone we can survey the wide sweep of revelation. Viewed from here, all teachers, all sects, all protestants, find their due location—Leo and Arius; Nicholas and Photius; Trent and the Confessio Augustana; the Vatican and Exeter Hall, or Lambeth Palace, or the Metropolitan Tabernacle. From the very nature of the Christian religion this must be so; for, not only has the Christian revelation never existed otherwise than in a religious community—in the Church of Christ,—but the very institution of that community is a fact which, like the fact of the Incarnation, forms a main portion of the Christian revelation itself. Therefore must every religious community justify its existence, in the face both of reason and of revelation. It must show its begin-

nings—its living root, as the same definite Church, in the past. It must produce the charter of its unequivocal right to the full possession of the truth that was once for all revealed and committed to its authoritative keeping. It cannot advance one step till its feet have been set on the firm and solid ground of an origin undeniably divine. Every communion must, at the very outset, grapple with the historical challenge of Tertullian: *edant origines suas*. Nought else will avail—no *ad captandum* assertions; no unauthorised assumptions of authority; no beaming light of a royal countenance; no decrees of a Privy Council. What reasonable or prudent man will commit himself to an eternal issue—and here the issues are eternal—on the strength of anything less than a *clearly* credible and exclusive authority to teach? The fact of a divine origin must, with perfect clearness, be established by an impartial and relentless logic. To trust to some probable, or conjectural, but untraced, link of connection with the past—to some problematical continuity that is supposed to find its way through the obscure mists surrounding, for instance, a defunct British Church—to act thus is most blindly to leap from inner into outer darkness. The feverish and frenzied assertions of continuity, that are heard arising from certain quarters, are so many frantic witnesses to a sober truth. This truth is the key of the whole position. Let the true Church be

once found, and her voice once heard—and all doubt and hesitation will cease. The conscientious and earnest man will no longer find himself committed to the dreary task, ever beginning and never ending, of painfully searching out the claims of each apparent truth for himself, only to discover at last that he holds nothing by firm unwavering faith, but either by the loose and feeble grasp of slippery opinion, or, as the case may be, with the quivering tenacity of alarm and blank despair. Who wrote the books of the New Testament v. gr. the Epistles? Were the unknown writers inspired? Are these books, indeed, the undoubted Word of God? How is this made clear to men? And what of the Old Testament Scriptures? Who were their authors? By what unfailing and absolutely reliable principle is the Canon of Scripture to be determined? How is a good simple soul enabled so to steer his bark amid these stormy waters as safely to arrive on the firm shore of an immovable faith? All questions are resolved into the one clear issue of Church authority. Of side-issues, of shirking and shuffling, of unmeaning vagueness and unwarranted assumption, we are weary almost to death.

Of course, this important matter has not been altogether overlooked. Much has been said and written about the Church, about her voice and authority, her beauty, her unfailing wealth of truth and grace. Anglicans are not unfrequently eloquent

in this department. Would they were as precise as they are eloquent! But the misfortune is that they never tell us what is the Church. It now appears to be something concrete, real and palpable, but so soon as we attempt to touch it, it becomes a mere vague something of religious beauty and floats away through the lofty inaccessible regions of the abstract and ideal. The Church must have had a clear meaning once; but now that meaning is as dark as the Sphinx's riddle. Thus the Rev. W. H. Stanton, Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, will write on 'The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief,' with a view to proving the necessity and reasonableness of listening to the *voice of the Church*, but declines, as his Reviewer, not without astonishment, remarks, to enter into an examination "of the true idea and definition of the Church." * Occasionally, as in W. Burton Pope's 'Higher Catechism' such an examination is attempted; and ends in the only too visible embarrassment of the writer. The Essayists of *Lux Mundi* afford no exception in the history of failure. They sail proudly along on a flood of phrase concerning the Church, her voice and authority, her office and power in the world, but when confronted with the questions: But what Church? And what authority? And how is it all proved?—they are miserably silent. Why are they so timid? Of what are they afraid?

* "The Thinker," March, 1892, No. 3, p. 335.

Why do they shrink back? Even their own friends can see the fatuity of this ostrich-like proceeding. Says the Rev. J. J. Lias. M.A.: "The mistake made by the Reformed Churches is becoming yet more evident at the present time. For the doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture is everywhere being energetically attacked, and is daily becoming more and more difficult to defend. Our present position is one of great peril. Men find the ground giving way under their feet, and there is danger of a headlong stampede to infidelity or to Rome, according as the non-religious or religious elements in our minds are the stronger." And again: "The Church of England has occupied a position midway between the two disputants (i.e. between Rome and the Reformed Churches). There has always been a considerable number of her members inclined to fall back upon Church authority. But when confronted with the question *what* Church authority, and how is its voice to make itself heard, they have often been inclined to give *contradictory or evasive* answers, Yet there can be little doubt that they were in the main right (?). The Roman Catholic view is clearly untenable" (?) We can admire the robust boldness of his cool unproved assumption that the claim of Rome is clearly untenable. But it is not as a model of boldness that we have quoted him. We have quoted him as an unimpeachable witness to the logical difficulty of the Anglican position, and to

the manner in which Anglicans have attempted either to evade or to leap that difficulty. The position is this. Christianity is a necessity—hence we must secure it. The authority of Scripture is crumbling away—but Christianity itself is ever-living and true. It lives in the living authority of the Church. Yet that Church is evidently—as we shall assume—not the Church of Rome. Therefore it must—as the Anglican position demands—be somewhere found in the Anglican establishment. This is surely nothing else but the last wild movement of a mind hopelessly baffled in its search for truth. How else can we account for the distressing fact that men in their sober senses should set their immortal hopes at hazard on the flimsy strength of such reasonings! How vastly different it all is in the Church of Rome! How superior the method of her Theologians! No Babel of "contradictory or evasive answers" which, in spite of being contradictory, are yet, by some logical legerdemain, found to be right in the main. Pursuing their course with fearless courage and inexorable science, the Roman Theologians arrive at an assured and unanimous conclusion. The Church is clearly manifest in the brightness of her authority and in the infallibility of her teaching office. Her visible Head is known. We can put our hands on the very throne of her power.

II.

In the recent Bampton Lectures, Mr. Gore essays to go a step further than his fellows in the way of explanation. He deals at length with the question of the Church, her function and authority. The upshot of his remarks is, that the Church rightly used her infallible power of defining doctrine at Nicæa, Ephesus and Chalcedon, but not at Trent or the Vatican Council. A plain man would have thought that the Church's office and duty, as an infallible teacher, was perpetual; that it must be as living and necessary, as patent and effective in the 19th century as in the fourth. But Mr. Gore completely puzzles us. Janus is outfaced. Even the Church smiles confidence only to betray. We walk for awhile under the shadow of her watchful protection, to be at length abandoned and sent wandering along unknown paths beneath the scorching rays. The Church was used to speak as the living teacher of mankind. But now for a long time, since a remote date not yet specified, she has been dumb. Her voice has gradually died away, or is no longer distinguishable! But we must consider the arguments with which Mr. Gore seeks to establish his theory. He rejects, as do we, the lifeless notion that we should at once return to the primitive state of an incipient Christianity, and be content with a few simple, clear-cut truths that are as exact in outline as pieces of hardware,

and just as incapable of growth and expansion. Such a view is entirely at variance with the most obvious lessons of history, and the best ascertained principles of nature. What lives must grow; it can never become, so long as it lives, absolutely devoid of activity and motion. Now, wherever there are doctrines upon which the restless mind of man is busy; wherever doubts, questions, difficulties arise; wherever faith is jeopardized by the upheaval of heresies that "must needs" be; the authority of the Church, ever wakeful and on the alert, must be present to guard the doctrines, to solve the doubts and to crush the heresy. Thus our vision widens, and the faith grows. If heresy must needs come, development of the truth is a happy necessity borne upon the dark wings of heresy itself—provided however there is an authoritative voice to which we can securely turn for an answer. Thus authority and development are essentially correlative. Development moves along under the guiding influence of a living teacher, and development cannot cease till either man's mind becomes the shroud of faith, or faith the shroud of man's mind. The truth must expand and unfold itself more and more fully, unless it be dead in man's heart, or man be dead to it. Yet this implies no addition to the primitive depositum of truth. The least of all seeds becomes the greatest of herbs; but what in the plant is a natural principle of this evolution, is, in the Church, a divinely-given magis-

terium. Mr. Gore adopts this view, but fails in its application; and fails for the simple reason that his application is merely arbitrary and partial. The Church, he contends, acted with divine power at Nicæa, Ephesus and Chalcedon, but did not act with the same power at the Councils of Trent and the Vatican! Where is the difference? The Church, he replies, exceeded the limits of her power in the later Councils, but kept well within them in the earlier Councils. This has been the angry cry of every heretic from the beginning until now. It was the burden of the charge made by Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites. This voice of discontent will be heard murmuring for ever. What, then, are the sure and certain limits of the Church's defining power? Mr. Gore answers: "Scripture proves, the Church teaches." There can be no truth of faith that is not *explicitly* contained in Scripture, and the sole function of the Church, in face of the questions addressed to her, is a merely negative function restricted to the bare elimination of interpretations that are false, and unable directly to posit the interpretation that is true. We can confidently refer to our Author's pages for the effectual bursting of this fanciful bubble. But even were the theory true, it would not make the Anglican claims one whit the stronger. It is logically impossible to admit the overpowering magisterium of the Church in respect of the Canon of Scripture, the binding authority of General

Councils, the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, infant baptism and baptism by heretics, Sunday instead of Sabbath-day observance, and the far-reaching conclusions arrived at in the great controversy on Grace and Original Sin—it is logically impossible to advance thus far without assuming the obligation of advancing farther. How is the definition of the Immaculate Conception more direct and positive than the decisions above mentioned? In what are the texts of Scripture in favour of the points enumerated, more explicit than the great Petrine texts? The Anglican attempt to manipulate Tradition is like Phaeton trying to guide the chariot of the sun. Anglicanism lies prone and helpless on the floor of Tradition because, to use St. Augustine's simile, it did not come in by the door, but fell in over the wall. Of course Mr. Gore is at perfect liberty to draw what pleasing horoscope he chooses for the Establishment; yet the sun of Rome, in all its splendour, majesty and power, will continue to roll on serenely just the same. At least one thing is evident—Anglicans in appealing to Tradition have uttered a spell "which evokes, whether they will or no, hosts of subtle associations, rising up like spirits out of the past centuries." These spirits it will be beyond their power to lay.

III.

There is another matter we must, at least briefly, touch upon, though its importance would demand something more than the mere passing notice which we are able now to bestow—viz.: what is the true logical position held by Church Authority in the order of revealed truths? Is it the first, and the foundation of all? When can we first invoke it? Is it its own warrant? If not, upon what prior doctrines is it based? How are those prior doctrines known?—These, and similar, questions immediately stare us in the face so soon as we enter upon an enquiry into the relations between faith and authority. The full bearing of such questions will be better understood from a short history, given by Rev. Principal Charles Chapman, LL.D., in the January (1892) Number of the 'Thinker.' Mrs. Besant, then, torn with doubt as to what she should believe of Christ—whether in His true Divinity or no—secured an interview with Dr. Pusey. Instead of finding her doubts answered and her objections met, she was told: "It is not your duty to ascertain the truth. It is your duty to accept and believe the truth as laid down *by the Church* . . . Did not the Lord promise that the presence of the Spirit should be ever with His Church, to guide her into all truth?" She answered: "But the fact of the promise and its value are the very points on which I am doubt-

ful . . . I must and will find out what is true, and I will not believe until *I am sure.*" Dr. Pusey rejoined: "You have no right to make terms with God as to what you will believe and what you will not believe." Mrs. Besant came away sad, hopeless, and unbelieving. Upon this narrative Dr. Chapman remarks: "No doubt Dr. Pusey was his true self in the demand made at the interview. For, strictly speaking, it is a superfluity for those who hold to the high doctrine of Church infallibility . . . to trouble themselves with reasonings to prove this or that Christian dogma . . . The only one consistent course is to prove, if possible, the right or power of the Church to decide . . . and then to demand of every one entire and instant submission. . . . Romanism is logical. High Anglicanism when dealing with doctrine is too often illogical . . . Dr. Pusey should have remembered that this doctrine of an infallible authority, over-riding all the thinking and judgments of individuals . . . is not itself an Article of Faith in the sense that the Deity of Christ is. It is a *preliminary question* to that of what is revealed concerning Christ. It cannot be established by assuming that the Church has right and power *ex cathedrâ* to settle it without appeal; for that is to beg the very question. It is to say, the infallible Church establishes the doctrine of its infallibility—a piece of logical nonsense. Reasons appealing to the judgment of men alone can serve in such a case; and

thus, even though it be shown that the Church is as infallible as is claimed in settling dogmas, they and its infallibility are ultimately made to rest on an appeal to the *reason as instructed by Scripture.*"

Dr. Chapman must pardon us for saying that he has been betrayed into unconscious, though none the less provoking, misrepresentation. A preliminary truth is one thing; a dogma of faith is another thing. An example will explain. What would be the use, for instance, of speaking to one who did not believe in a God about the contents of a divine revelation? Unless a man first holds it for truth that God exists, not only will he not believe the supposed revelation, but he must, on principle, deny even its possibility. Thus the doctrine of God's existence is to us, here and now, a preliminary question to that of what has been revealed. Yet one of the truths contained in the Christian revelation—the very first Article of the Creed—is identical in terms with the preliminary truth on which all revelation depends, viz.: that of God's existence. Is this revelation of God's existence a piece of illogical nonsense? By no means. But what was only a preliminary doctrine has now put on the garb of a dogma. This gives us a reply to Dr. Chapman. So far is it from being a fact that the "doctrine" of Church Authority is a "preliminary question" to that of the Deity of Christ, that the very opposite is the case. The *dogma* of Church Authority is logically antecedent to the *dogma* of the Deity of Christ;

but the *doctrine* of the Deity of Christ is a truth preliminary to the *dogma* of Church Authority. The broad principle of the Catholic position is this: such a strong and firm assent of the mind as is required in an act of true faith cannot be lawfully elicited until the assent itself has been antecedently justified on sure and solid grounds.* Without an antecedent and persuasive assurance of the prudence of belief, faith would fall from the lofty height of virtue into the dark abyss of blind credulity; and we should be most illogically logical were we to pretend that belief in the specific dogma of Church Authority formed any solitary exception to the rule. The first two volumes of Dr. Schanz's Apology have dealt with the truths that a man must hold before he can accept with safety the Authority of the Church.—These preliminary truths are seven:—the Existence of God, the Possibility of Revelation, the Fact of Revelation, the History of the Old Testament as substantially genuine, the substantially Authentic Character of the New Testament, the Deity of Christ, the Institution of an enduring Apostolate. A man must be in reason satisfied about these points, before surrendering his mind to the dogma of the infallibility of the Church—unless, indeed, he clearly sees a way of establishing the Divine Authority of the Church by arguments not drawn from the New Testament Scriptures.

Catholic Theologians, then, no more claim for

* See Vol. II. of this Apology, c. ix. "Reason and Revelation."

themselves the right of assuming the Authority of the Church, than Protestants may claim the right of assuming the inspiration and Divine Authority of the Bible. Though we must confess that, if any assumption had necessarily to be made, it would be far more justifiable on our part than on theirs. The Catholic Church now is, and long has been, a potent and living factor in the history of mankind. Something of the brightness of her divine origin shines like a halo round her head. Incessu patuit Dea. Her influence for good, her marvellous authority, the charm of her unity, her inflexible courage, her infinite adaptability, her unwavering self-consistency, her wonderful energy, her untiring patience, her strange miraculous triumphs over every vicissitude and danger, her enduring power, her indestructible vitality; the long and glorious list of her saints; the keen and subtle intellects who have obeyed her; the vast creations of her administration, the touching works of her beneficence, the majesty and wisdom of her ritual and sacramental system—all these things furnish an evident and striking contrast to the spectacle of a Bible sadly mutilated by the hands of German criticism, and to the discordant and warring atoms of broken sects.

The same complete misunderstanding of the Catholic position is apparent in the other passage of Dr. Chapman's criticism, in which he says: "even though it be shown that the Church is as

infallible as is claimed in settling dogmas, they and its infallibility are ultimately made to rest on an appeal to the reason as instructed by Scripture." He should have said—as instructed by *history*. Matthew or Mark might, without being inspired, have written history just as true and reliable as that of Thucydides or Lingard. Without any special Divine assistance, they could have given us a contemporary record which, in its breadth and substance, was faithful to fact. This simply historical and merely general accuracy is all the "Scriptural" instruction that is required as a preliminary to establishing the authority of the Catholic Church. But when Dr. Chapman supposes, as he seems to suppose, that the infallibility of the Church is ultimately made to rest on reason as instructed by Scripture, and by Scripture understands the unquestionably inspired word of God, he is simply setting Catholic Theology on its head, with its heels in the air. Such a deep, hidden, and stupendous doctrine as the dogma of Divine inspiration can be brought home to our hearts only on the commanding testimony of an undoubtedly Divine witness. Hence the famous saying of S. Augustine :* "For my part, I should not believe the Gospel except I were moved by the authority of the Catholic Church." It were, perhaps, too much to hope that mistakes, such as that of Dr. Chapman, will in future cease ; but the 'Apology'

* Reply to Manichæn's Fundamental Epistle, c. 5. n. 6.

of Dr. Schanz will, at any rate, furnish one reason more for holding such mistakes less excusable.

In this third volume we have endeavoured to meet the wishes of those who criticized the two previous volumes. The criticisms were not only fair, but even kind and generous. We have used greater freedom in the translation than heretofore. Moreover, we have numbered all the paragraphs—some—marked thus * —we have re-arranged; others—marked thus † —we have ourselves added as well as a large number of notes.‡ We have great confidence that the volume will commend itself to the English student of Theology. We must again express our obligations to the REV. J. McINTYRE, D.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, for his constant assistance.

S. MARY'S, OSCOTT, BIRMINGHAM,
Feast of S. John Baptist, June 24th, 1892.

‡ As a consequence the number of pages has increased to such an extent that it was found impossible to join the promised Index to this III. volume.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

FINALITY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

PAGE

1 The Tutorship of Revelation ceasing with the Advent of Christ—2 Revelation completed and closed by Christ: Christian Revelation Absolute and Final—3 John the Baptist the Last of the Prophets: Christ the Fulfilment of all Prophecy—4 The Reason being His Divine Sonship—5 The Advent of the Holy Ghost not for the Purpose of a New Revelation, but for the complete Understanding of Christ's Revelation—6 Proof from the Words and Practice of the Apostles—7 Proof from the Post Apostolic Age: the Church claimed to teach no other Doctrine but that delivered by the Apostles—8 Private Revelations of no account to the Catholic Deposit of Faith—9 Christian Revelation, though materially Absolute and Perfect, does not exclude Formal Perfectibility—10 Christ implanted a New Vital Principle both in the Individual Man, and in the Church as a Living Society: Development and Growth a Necessary Consequence—11 The Law of Progress recognised by the Apostles—12 The Apostolic Deposit not delivered by way of a Full and Perfect Doctrinal System—13 The Contents of the Divine Deposit require Unfolding at the Hand of a Living, Intelligent Agent, and under the Assistance of the Holy Ghost—14 The Rule of S. Vincent of Lerin: *Quod Semper*, etc.—15 His Analogy from Living Organisms applied to the Growth and Development of Dogma: Development not Change—16 The Principle of Tradition, that is, the Combination of Conservatism with Progress, distinguishes the Catholic Church from All Other Communions—17 Development due to Causes Internal and External—18 Heresies,

PAGE

according to the Fathers, are an Occasion for Development—19 History confirms it—20 The Various Stages of Development may be traced in the Chief Doctrines on the Trinity and Incarnation—21 Prohibition of the Council of Ephesus to add to the Nicene Creed—22 The Living Spirit in the Church never Inactive—23 Development in the Dogma of Grace, Free Will, Justification, Sacraments—24 Development in Cultus, Worship, Life of the Church—25 Difference between Catholic Church and Other Communions in this respect—26 Development the Law of every Religion—27 The Catholic Church holds the Golden Mean between the Fossil Conservatism of Greek and Protestant Churches, and the Infinite Material Perfectibility of Rationalism—28 Protestantism puts the Individual Subjective Spirit in Place of the Spirit of the Church—29 The Distinction between Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Truths a Snare and a Delusion—30 The Vatican Council on Development 1-39

CHAPTER II.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1 The Messianic Kingdom predicted by the Prophets: A Kingdom of Peace and Justice—2 The Name "Kingdom of Heaven" first in Daniel: Established by the "Son of Man"—3 Jewish Hopes of a New Kingdom—4 The Kingdom of Heaven in the Gospel of S. Matthew—5 In the Gospels of the other Evangelists—6 Further Description by S. Matthew: The Eight Beatitudes—7 The Spiritual Character of the New Kingdom—8 Obligations and Duties in the New Kingdom on Earth—9 Internal and External Aspect of the New Kingdom: Its Visibility—10 Conditions of Membership: Confession of the Name of Jesus, Baptism, Observance of Precepts—11 Visible Sign of Communion: Eucharist—12 The Fortunes of the New Kingdom as illustrated by the Parables—13 External and Internal Growth—14 Value of the Kingdom of Heaven—15 The Kingdom of God according to the Apostolic Epistles—16 Both a Heavenly Gift and a Visible Community—17 Christ's Disciples the First Beginning of this New Society or Kingdom—18 Disciples in the

PAGE

Narrow and Wider Sense; Election of the Twelve; Their Gradual Understanding—19 Unity between Disciples and Believers—20 The Good Shepherd—21 Definition of the New Kingdom 40-64

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE.

1 The Word "Church," and its Meaning in the Gospel of S. Matthew—2 Twice used with Reference to Hierarchy—3 Omitted by Other Evangelists from Causes External; Substitution of the Phrase, "Kingdom of God"—4 Incidents in the Gospel of S. John having Reference to the Church, v. g. Inscription on the Cross; Seamless Garment; Words of Jesus to His Mother standing by the Cross; Piercing of the Side—5 The Church as represented in the Acts of the Apostles—6 The Church Universal and the Churches Particular—7 Organization of New Christian Communities: *Ecclesia Docens et Discens*—8 The Church and the Churches in the Pauline Epistles; All One Great Brotherhood; the Church of God—9 Rare Occurrence of the Word in the Epistles of James and John—10 Further Details on the Nature of the Church, especially from S. Paul—11 Metaphor of Edifice—12 Metaphor of Organism, Body—13 Metaphor of Matrimony—14 The Church as the Continuation of the Incarnation, as the Intermediary Organ of applying the Work of Redemption—15 Real Truths underlying all those Metaphors—16 Religious Life in the Apostolic Church; Prayer and the Breaking of Bread in Separate Assemblies—17 The Lord's Supper as the New Paschal Feast—18 Visible Guidance of the New Community by the Holy Spirit, communicated by Ordination—19 External Organization Necessary for the Continuance of the Gospel; Collections for the Poor in Jerusalem—20 Definitions of the Church: Catholic Definitions—21 Non-Catholic Definitions 65-103

CHAPTER IV.

MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

1 The Existence of False Churches, Sects, and Heresies renders it

PAGE

necessary to have Evident Signs of Recognition or Distinctive Marks—2 Such are Sanctity, Unity, Apostolicity, Catholicity—3 Indicated in Scripture, and urged by Fathers: Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Vincent of Lerin—4 The Same mentioned in Nicene Creed—5 The Vatican Council on the Subject—6 The General *Motiva Credibilitatis* also of Use: The Notes themselves are *Motiva Credibilitatis*—7 Degree of Credibility derived from Them—8 Distinction between Marks and Properties—9 The Mutual Relations between the Two, and between the Several Marks Themselves 104–110

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH APOSTOLIC.

I.—Testimony of Scripture—

1 The Apostles are Witnesses for Christ and Representatives of Him, and Dispensers of His Mysteries: Their Office must continue—2 They are Witnesses, internally qualified by the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and by the External Commission or Authority of Christ—3 Proof from Gospels and Acts—4 The Apostolate, not a mere Missionary Duty, but an Ecclesiastical Office and Dignity—5 Objection against the Corporate Character of the Apostolate—6 The Apostolate, not the Result of Historical Development, but a Divine Institution—7 Apostles Proper, and in the Wider Sense: Barnabas—8 Conditions of the Apostolate—9 The Manner of Exercising It, no Proof against It: The Apostles are Representatives of God, not of the Community—11 The Need of being taught by Apostles never ceases; Apostles, Prophets, Teachers: the Latter Two not necessarily Ecclesiastical Offices—12 Continuity of Apostles in Post-Apostolic Times—13 Not merely in Their Writings, but rather in an Organized Ministry—14 Proof from Acts, Epistles, especially Pastoral Epistles . . .

II.—Testimony of the Fathers—

15 Clement of Rome on the Apostolic Office—On Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons—16 Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr—

PAGE

17 Apostolic Succession of Supreme Importance with the Fathers: Historical Proofs of Succession given by Hegesippus and Irenæus—18 Apostolic Succession Part of the Living Faith of the Church, especially Succession in the Roman Church—19 The Apostle's Creed—20 Irenæus on the Apostolic Succession as the Organ of Truth and Rule of Faith—21 Tertullian on the Same—22 Cyprian—23 The Alexandrian Fathers: Clement—24 Origen—25 Apostolicity applied to the Canon of Scripture—26 Augustine—27 His Main Argument not weakened by Collateral Arguments from Scripture—28 The Schoolmen: S. Thomas . . . . .

III.—Testimony of Heretics.

29 Early Heretics—30 Protestants—31* British and Northern Sects, False Idea of Apostolicity 111–169

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH ONE.

1 Love and Selfishness Causes of Union and Division: Babel and Confusion of Tongues—2 Religious Divisions—3 God's Care for Restoring Unity in the Old Testament—4 Greek Language and Roman Empire a remote Preparation—5 Prophecies concerning the One Messianic Kingdom—6 Christianity the Fulfilment of the Prophecies: Unity of God, of Truth, of Church—7 Unity of Faith, Life, Constitution, a Mark of the Church—8 Proof of Unity from the First Pentecost—9 Baptism and Eucharist as Means of Union—10 The Apostleate as a Means of Union between Jews and Gentiles: Warning against Schism and Heresy—11 Unity of Faith in the Church as a Whole—12 Baptism the Symbol of Unity—13 Not of itself, but by means of the Visible Church guided by the Holy Ghost—14 The Enemies of the Church favour Separatist Tendencies; Julian the Apostate—15 The Fathers of the Church connect the Proof of Unity with that of Apostolicity; Ignatius, Polycarp—16 Hegesippus, Justine, Hermas, Cyprian—17 Heresies a Witness to the Unity of the Church—18 Cyprian on the Unity of the Church—19 the Donatists and St. Augustine—20 Greek Schism—Western, or Papal Schisms—22 Reformation . . 170–197

PAGE

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

1 The Name not Biblical; but Universality of the Church clearly predicted by the Prophets—2 The First Traces of the Word in the Ignatian Epistles, and in the Account of the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Its Meaning—3 Also in the *Fragmentum Muratori*—4 The Term applied to the Canonical Epistles—5 The Apostolic and Nicene Creeds—6 Patristic Explanations of the Catholicity of the Church: Augustine—7 Heretics obliged to call the Church by that Name—8 The Argument from Catholicity as used by the Fathers against Heretics—9 Numerical Preponderancy of the Catholic Church—10 Territorial Universality as compared with that of Sects—11 Missionary Activity of the Catholic Church: The Sects generally recruit from the Church—12 Protestant Missions: The *Formula Concordiæ*—13 No Change in the Primitive View of the Church Catholic—14 Nothing short of a Community will satisfy the Cravings of the Human Heart . 198-214

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CHURCH INFALLIBLE.

1* Absolute Revelation and Infallible Authority: Are they Correlatives? The *a priori* Argument . . . . .

I.—Infallibility of the Apostles, and the Apostolic Church—

2 Infallibility promised to the Apostles, and to the Apostolic Church, in Perpetuity—3 Testimony of Döllinger: Vain Attempts at explaining away the Promises—4 Promises how applied to All the Faithful—5 The Apostles claimed Infallibility—6 Peter's Uncertainty as to the Reception of Heathens: No Argument to the Contrary—7 Paul's Rebuke of Peter according to Ancients and Moderns—8 Apostles, though Infallible, not all at once Perfect in the Knowledge of how Revealed Truths were to be applied—9* Difference between the Infallibility of the Apostles and that of the Church . . . .

PAGE

II.—Formal Proof for the Infallibility of the Church—

10 Historical Proof; Irenæus; Tertullian; Origen; Lactantius —11 How the Fathers conceived it, and to whom they attributed it—12 Infallibility manifested in Œcumenical Councils—13 Augustine on the Authority of Bishops and Councils—14 Councils never erred: Chalcedon and Constantinople on the Three Chapters—15 Councils of Constance and Lateran on the Superiority of Councils over the Pope—16 Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia—17 The *Latrocinium* of Ephesus—18 Adverse Statements at the Time of the Western Schism: Pierre d'Ailly and Nicolas of Cusa; S. Antoninus of Florence—19 Middle Ages—20 Council of Trent—21 Infallibility and the Reformers: Their Own Infallibility—22 Infallibility of the Bible . .

III.—Material Proof—

23 Proof from the Actual Fact—24 Millenium not to the Point —25 Constitution of Church ever the same—26 Pelagianism of the Schoolmen a Fiction—27 Hase's Objection against Infallibility: Forsaken by Scripture—28 Unsupported by Firm Tradition—29 Made to rest only on a Philosophical Basis of Supposed Necessity—30 A Brilliant Dream to suit Circumstances .

IV.—Nature and Extent of Infallibility—

31 Assistance, not Revelation, or Inspiration; In Matters of Faith and Morals; In formal definitions—32* Further Explanation as to Who is Infallible, How, and When? . 215-266

CHAPTER IX.

THE CHURCH NECESSARY FOR SALVATION.

1 The Old Theocracy Exclusive and Particularistic—2 Its Tendency to Universality in the Future—3 The New Israel both Universal and Exclusive—4 The Teaching of the N. T. as to Salvation in Jesus alone—5 S. John's Gospel lays stress on the Necessity of Faith, Baptism, and Eucharist—6 Testimonies of the Apostles on the Subject: S. John—7 S. Paul—8 S. Peter—9 S. James—10 Marked Opposition between the Church and the World foretold by Christ—11 S. Paul on Christians as

PAGE

the Elect—12 Baptism as the Symbol and Cause of our Death and Life in Christ—13 What is True of Christianity, is True of the Church—14 Application of this Principle by the Apostles Themselves—The Post-Apostolic Age knows of No Christianity outside the Church: Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria—16 The Sects not the Cause, but the Occasion for affirming That Doctrine—17 The Example of Noah's Ark used by the Fathers, especially S. Cyprian—18 S. Cyprian and Augustine deny True Martyrdom to Heretics—19 Augustine's View of Heretical Baptism: Valid, but Ineffectual, and Unprofiting outside the Church—20 Augustine on Invisible Members of the Church: Fulgentius of Ruspe—21 The Greek Fathers on the Subject—22 First Ecclesiastical Utterances in Africa—23 The Athanasian Creed—24 Boniface VIII.'s Dictum a mere Summing Up of an Old and General Doctrine: Tertullian, Augustine—25 Ecclesiastical Decision on the Subject Unnecessary. Some, however, exist: Lateran Council, *Professio fidei* required of the Waldenses, Council of Trent, Creed of Pius IV.—26 Modern Theologians on "*Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*"—27 Reformers equally Exclusive: *Confessio*, *Apologia*, Luther, Calvin—28 Laxer View adopted by later Protestants—29 Non-Catholic Theologians of Modern Days less Unjust to the Catholic Doctrine—30 Real Meaning of the Catholic Principle: Principle and Application, Augustine—31 S. Thomas—32 Modern Theologians: Pius IX., Syllabus—33* Various Kinds of Members of the Church—34 God's Providence and Saving Will Universal—35 The Church's Attitude towards Sinners—36 Treatment of Heretics in General—37 Extreme Penalty of Death: View of the Fathers—38 The Doctrine and Practice of the Middle Ages—39 The Inquisition: Protestant and other Impartial Testimonies—40 Religious Toleration: Protestant Views of it—41 Conclusion: The Catholic Doctrine thoroughly Consistent . 267-315

CHAPTER X.

THE CHURCH HOLY.

1 Holiness both a Property and a Mark of the True Church—2 Early Heretics have misapplied this Mark—3 The Sanctity of the

PAGE

Church as understood by the *Fathers*: First Element Her Doctrine—4 Second Element Her Means of Grace—5 The Sacramental System as explained more fully by the Schoolmen with Holy Eucharist as Centre—6 Congruity of Seven Sacraments according to Roman Catechism—7 Goethe on the Wonderful Organism of the Catholic Sacraments—8 Influence of the External Worship upon the Internal and Moral Life: Holiness in the Moral Sense shown forth in the Members of the Church—9 The *Fathers* on this Holiness—10 Practice of the Evangelical Counsels—11 The Saints of the Past and from the Beginning belong to the Catholic Church—12 The Church on Earth comprises Saints and Sinners—13 Corruption of the Church in the 16th Century much exaggerated: The so-called Reformation No Advance towards Holiness—14 Contempt of the Reformers for Evangelical Counsels—15 True Reformation on the Side of the Council of Trent—16 Church's Holiness as Independent of that of her Members—17 Bellarmine on Sanctity as a Note of the Church—18 Statistics of Holiness Impossible—19 Statistics of Crime Unreliable—20 Miracles as a Sign and Means of Further Holiness; Irenæus; Luther—21 The Church Militant and Triumphant; Eight Beatitudes; Roman Catechism—22 Purgatory, or, the Church Suffering—23† Definition of Holiness. 316-346

CHAPTER XI.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

1 Grace and Truth Destined for All Men: How are they to reach the Individual? Historical Solution of the Question . .

I.—In the Time of Christ and the Apostles—

2 Personal Teaching of Christ—3 Christ, though familiar with the Written Method, left No Writings—4 Reasons Why? The Might of the Living Word; Example of Other Founders of Religion—5 Apostles not commanded to Write, but to Preach and Teach: Reasons Why?—6 Living Tradition, especially Necessary in Matters of Worship—7 External Reasons such as Fear of Profanation of the Divine Mysteries—8 Measures taken by the Apostles to provide for the Future: Appointment of

PAGE

Pastors and Teachers—9 The Apostolic Epistles merely Occasional—10 Gospels not a Substitute for Preaching—11 But intended to deepen and strengthen Oral Teaching—12 Apostolic Preaching implies Authority and Assistance of the Holy Ghost: Teaching by the Power of the Spirit—13 The Scripture Principle, therefore, Unbiblical and Unhistorical . . .

II.—In the Ante-Nicene Age—

14 The Principle of Faith according to the Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius Martyr: Truth is with the Apostolic Succession—15 The Epistle to Diognetus: Papias—16 Polycarp: The Clementines—17 Tradition the Ordinary Method of Faith—18 Irenæus—19 Tertullian—20 Testimony of the Church—21 Origen confesses to the Principle of Tradition with Scripture in Support—22* A Change of Principle Impossible .

III.—Objections considered—

23 Alleged Protest of the African Church against the Sovereignty of Tradition—24 Tertullian's Objection against Custom—25 Cyprian's Objection against Custom in Matters of Re-Baptism—26 Firmilian's Objection against the Roman Tradition—27 Augustine on Cyprian's Attitude: On the Creed as an Epitome of Scripture Truths—28 Cyril of Jerusalem: Instruction of Catechumens—29 The True Scriptures are received at the Hands of the Church: Faith without Authority unknown to the Ancients—30 Reading of Scripture Unpracticable: True Position of Scripture as an Instrument of Doctrine for the *Magisterium Ecclesiasticum*—31 The Schools of Antioch and Alexandria: Arius—32 No Change at Nicaea—33 Eusebius of Emesa—34 Augustine's *Dictum*, "Faith will totter if the Authority of Scripture begin to shake"—35 *Sufficientia Scripturæ* . .

IV.—In the Post-Nicene Age.

36 Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodosius—37 Vincent of Lerin: His Canon and Commonitorium—38 Augustine's Canon: Negative and Positive Element in Tradition—39 Tradition in Matters of Sacred Liturgy: Basil—40 The Apostolic Constitutions—41 *Lex Supplicandi est Norma Credendi*—42 The Schoolmen on the Principle of Faith—43 Opposition Insignificant: Abælard, Nominalists . .

PAGE

V.—At the Time of the Reformation and Since—

44 Luther's Material and Formal Principle—45 Many Contradictions involved in His System—46 It undermines the whole Fabric of the Church—47 Tradition and the Council of Trent—48 Further Inconsistencies of the Reformers—49 Hase's Contention that Both the Catholic and Protestant Churches have acted consistently with regard to Tradition—50 Catholic Tradition even humanly considered the Highest Guarantee Possible of Truth: Kepler's Testimony—51 The Catacombs—52 Historical Demonstration from Tradition at times Difficult—53 Tradition and Development go hand in hand—54* Alleged Doctrines in which the Principle of Tradition is said to break down—55 Twofold Character of Tradition; Divine and Human Element—Witnesses not All of the Same Authority—56 Contents of the Catholic Faith the Same Now as in Antiquity—57 The Church Her own Witness to Tradition; Vatican Council—58† R. H. Hutton on Tradition, Development, and Authority of the Church 347-416

CHAPTER XII.

THE PRIMACY OF S. PETER.

1 A Visible Church requires a Visible Head—2 Direct Scriptural Evidence for Peter's Pre-eminence: His Call according to Matthew and Mark—3 His Call according to Luke—4 His Position in the Apostolic College—5 His Confession of Faith—6 Peter at the Transfiguration and at the Passion: Denial—7 His Position after the Resurrection—8 Cumulative Evidence from all the Various Incidents—9 The Special Petrine Texts of Scripture: Matthew xvi. 18-19—10 Historical-Grammatical Interpretation decisive against all Evasions—11 The Patristic Interpretation of the Passage—12 Metaphorical Character No Difficulty—13 Foundation a Relative Term: Applied to Christ, Peter, Apostles; Explanation of S. Leo, Augustine, Thomas—14 Relation of Peter to the other Apostles—15 Metaphor of the *Keys*, of *Binding* and *Loosing*—16 Key of Knowledge too Narrow and Interpretation—17 The Fathers on the Subject—18 Matthew xviii. 18, no Objection—19 Patristic Appeal to Matthew xvi. for Episcopal Succession in

PAGE

General—20† The Second Great Petrine Text: Luke xxii. 31, 32; Repetition of the Promise of Primacy—21 The Third Special Petrine Text: John xxi. 15-17; Fulfilment of the Promise; Collation of Primacy—22 Patristic Interpretation—23 Extension of the Text to the Church at large—24 Peter's Primacy one of Real Jurisdiction—25 Juxta-Position of Peter and Paul in the Roman Church—26 The *Exercise* of the Primacy in Apostolic Times—27 According to the *Acts of the Apostles*—28 According to the *Pauline Epistles*—29 Dispute at Antioch—30 Vatican Definition 417-464

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRIMACY OF THE POPE.

I.—Perpetuity of Peter's Primacy—

1* The Church being Perpetual, Peter's Primacy must needs be Perpetual—2 The Primacy more Necessary in Post-Apostolic Times than in the Apostolic Age—3* Its Perpetuity not a mere Inference from Reason or Scripture, but *directly* declared in Scripture—4† The Primacy is the Only Means of continuing the Apostolate which is certainly Perpetual—5 Historical Conviction of the Perpetuity: *Consensus Patrum* . . . . . .

II.—The Roman Succession—

6 Who are Peter's Successors? Answer from History: The Roman Bishops by Right Divine and Apostolic—7 Indirect Evidence from *New Testament* as to Peter's Roman Sojourn: The *Acts* and *Epistle to the Romans*—8 *First Epistle of S. Peter;* Babylon; *Gospel of S. John*—9 Tradition Unanimous as to Peter's Roman Sojourn; Clement; Ignatius; Papias—10 Further Testimonies: Dionysius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cajus—11 Verdict of Protestant Historians—12 Peter's Roman Episcopate of Twenty-five Years—13 Papal Catalogues and Roman Succession . . . .

III.—Evidence for the Existence and Development of Papal Primacy—

14* Gradual Development of the Primacy—15 Earliest Testimonies: Clement of Rome and Ignatius M.—16 Classical Passage of Irenæus—17 Cyprian—18 Ambrose—19 Jerome—20

PAGE

Augustine—21 General Councils—22 Testimony of Eastern Church—23 Eastern Councils: Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Antioch A.D. 340, Sardica A.D. 344—24 African Church in the Pelagian Controversy—25 Reasons why Rome elected as Seat of the Primacy; Leo the Great; Political Recognition of the Primacy—26 Papal Titles—27 Testimony of Heretics: *Roma semper Victrix*—28 Papal Supremacy in the Middle Ages; Nicholas I.—29* Pseudo-Isidore, and the False Decretals—30 The Schoolmen: Bonaventure, Thomas—31 Mediæval Councils; Lateran iv., v.; Council of Florence; Trent—32 Council of the Vatican summing up the Entire Previous Tradition—33 Conclusion: Discourse of S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury 465-503

CHAPTER XIV.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

1* Impossible to define *à priori* every single Right included in the Primacy; Schulte; History must be consulted—2* The Infallible Magisterium a Chief Function of the Primacy: Consequently subject to Development like the Primacy—3† Internal Connexion between Magisterium and Primacy: The Power of Teaching an Act of Order and Jurisdiction . . .

I.—Evidence of Scripture—

4 Papal Infallibility implied in Matthew xvi. 16–19—5 Likewise in John xxi. 15–17—6 Directly taught in Luke xxii. 31, 32; Döllinger on the Text—7† Infallibility attached to the Apostolate (John xiv.-xvii.); but the Apostolate survives only in Peter's Successor, the Pope—8 Patristic Interpretation of Luke xxii., 31, 32; Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Leo, Pelagius II., Martin I., Agatho—9† Evidence summed up by Cardinal Manning . . . .

II.—Evidence of Tradition in the First Seven Centuries—

10 Necessity for carefully sifting the Evidence of Tradition; Two Faults to be avoided; Case as stated by Cardinal Manning in his *Religio Viatoris*—11 *Ecclesia Romana*, Meaning of the

PAGE

Expression; Irenæus, Ambrose, Jerome—12 Augustine on the *Ecclesia Romana*—13* Testimony of the Earliest Greek Church, Ignatius, Clement, Irenæus; *Unique* Testimony of Irenæus—14 The Greek Fathers: Epiphanius, Gregory Naz., Theodoret, Ephrem, Stephen of Dori, Abbot Maximus—15 Testimony of the Popes: Julius I., Innocent I., Sixtus III., Leo I., Felix II., Gelasius—16 *Formula Hormisdæ* testifies to Infallibility as a Historical Fact and as a Dogmatic Necessity; Pope Agatho determines the Elements of Infallibility; *Subjectum, Objectum, Causam et Conditionem;* Bishop Hefele on Agatho's Letter; Roman Synod under Agatho—17 Popes not always deciding Questions of Faith *in Synod*—18* Councils and Synods not Useless on the Hypothesis that the Pope is Infallible—19† There are not Two Infallibilities in the Church, as there is but One Apostolic Magisterium—20 History of Pope Honorius: Effect of His Letter upon the Catholic World at the Time; His Condemnation by the VIth General Council—21 Various Methods adopted by Catholic Apologists to meet the Difficulty against Papal Infallibility—22 Hefele's Solution preferred—23 Subsequent Effects of the Condemnation upon East and West

III.—Evidence of Tradition in the Middle Ages.

24 Distinction between Personal and Official Infallibility; Possibility of a Heretical Pope—25 Official Infallibility recognized in the Middle Ages: Aldhelm, Theodore Studita, Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas I., Æneas of Paris, Peter Damian, Leo IX.—26* Langen's Misrepresentation of Papal Infallibility—27* New Stage of Development in the XIIIth Century; Doctrine of S. Thomas; Janus' Imputation—28 S. Bonaventure: Duns Scotus—29* The Gallican Reaction explained—30 The Definition of the Vatican Council . 504-552

CHAPTER XV.

THE CHURCH AND CIVILIZATION.

1 The Church is the Mother of True Civilization—Necessity for insisting on the Fact—2 The Influence of Religion in general recognized by Antiquity—3 The Old Religions incapable of regenerating the

PAGE

World—Christianity alone able to accomplish it—4 Example of Jesus—His Kingdom Spiritual—5 The Apostolic Church and Her Example—Charity and Care of the Poor—Deacons—6 Christianity and Slavery—Christian Relationship between Master and Slave—Universal Brotherhood—7 Complete Revolution of Ideas—Care for Sick and Poor—8 The Early Apologists :— M. Felix—Tertullian—Cyprian—Gregory of Naz. and Nyssa on the Subject—9 Bishops the Fathers of the Poor and Widows —Early Attempts at Organized Charity—10 Testimony of Julian the Apostate—11 Monasteries became New Homes for the Poor—12 The Church not encouraging Indolence, but ennobling Labour—13 Her Influence upon the whole System of Political Economy—14 Gradual Abolition of Slavery—15 Universal Regeneration of Society—16 Islam arresting the Work of Civilization—17 Christianity and the Position of Woman—18 Christianity and Civil Legislation—19 The Compact Organization of the Catholic Church alone could save Europe from a Return to Barbarism—20 Christian Virtues the Seed of True Culture—21 Social Regeneration of Mankind used as an argument by the Early Apologists for the Truth of Christianity—22 Gradual Relaxation of Christian Morals—23* Christianity a Source of Intellectual Progress—24 Conversion of Many Philosophers—25 Contempt of the Fathers for Philosophy explained—26 Faith and Philosophy join hands—Augustine, Thomas—27 Modern Philosophy indebted to Christianity—28 Study of Classics in the Church—29 Study of Nature and Natural Science encouraged by Bible, Fathers, Church—30 Judgment of Fathers liberal, though, at times, severe—31 The same Principles ever maintained in the Church—32 Prohibition of the Study of Physical Science in the Middle Ages explained—33 Albertus Magnus and Roger Bacon—34 Christopher Columbus, Vasco de Gama, Copernicus, Kepler—Men of Faith as well as Science—The Works of Missionaries, especially Jesuits—35 The First Reformers had no part in this Scientific Movement of the Age—36 Giordano Bruno Galileo—37 Conflicts at times unavoidable—38 The Church and the Fine Arts—32 The Church brings into Harmony all the Powers of Man—40 The Vatican Council on Faith and Reason—Christian Nations are still heading the March of Civilization—Jesus Christ the Alpha and Omega 553-600

PAGE

APPENDIX I.

† The Anglican View of the Pope's Primacy, by Dr. W. Bright . 601-608

APPENDIX II.

† The Reunion of Christendom 609-618

CHAPTER I.

FINALITY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

1. Divine Revelation, following the law of progress, came by slow degrees. It opened with the Protevangelium* in Paradise, and closed with the complete revelation of the Father in His only begotten Son. All revelation, from first to ast, had for its aim and object Him who was to come in the "fulness of time" (Ephes. I. 10; Gal. IV. 4) to save mankind. Hence as the time which God in His eternal counsels had appointed for the redemption of mankind drew near, the rays of prophecy gained in brilliancy, and the image of the promised Messias stood out more clearly and more distinctly on the horizon. God, in His wisdom, stooped to man's capacity, and trained him to fix his weak eyes on the blazing sun of truth by letting in a little light at a time,—just as much as he could bear, and no more. Thus each streak of light prepared the way for one to follow, and this again expanded and developed the preceding. But when the day dawned, shadows had to flit away. As soon as the Expected One of Israel and the nations appeared, preparation was at an end. With the advent of Christ and the establishment of the Kingdom of God, the mere tutorship of revelation ceased; for Christ, the

* First Gospel or message of future salvation. Strictly speaking this is not quite correct. The supernatural condition of Adam and Eve before the Fall presupposes a supernatural revelation. See Vatican Council Sess. III. C. II. quoted in *Christian Apology* Vol. II. p. 279. Tr.

fulness of truth, was the goal of the Old Testament, and in the truth revealed by Him, truth attained its zenith. "I know," said the woman at Jacob's well, "that the Messias cometh, who is called Christ; therefore when he is "come, he will tell us all things." (John iv. 25.) Just as the tutor's office ceases, as soon as the pupil has grown into a full and perfect man, so, in like manner, mankind were sure, sooner or later, to be sufficiently educated to receive God's revealed truth in its entirety.

2. Furthermore, the universality of Christian revelation stamps it as the highest and fullest truth. Unlike the Old Testament revelation, it is not addressed to one man, family or people, but to all men, and all nations and peoples, of all ages and climes. It has cast aside its national garb, broken down the barriers of particularism, and opened wide its gates to all peoples and tribes. But it was enabled to effect this result, because it is as universal in its contents as in its purpose. Both in its extent and intensity it appeals to all men, and concerns all alike. All religious truth, whether natural or supernatural, is contained within its grasp, and is there blent in one with that highest truth which the Only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, has brought down to earth. In the Christian revelation both Jews and Gentiles can slake their thirst for sovereign truth, and satisfy their pantings for the fountains of living waters. By Faith Christian truth was to become the common property of all men of all times.[1]

3. With Christ, as both the Prophets and the Apostles have told us, came the fulness of time, and the world entered on its last stage. Only one act in the great drama remains,—the coming of the Judge of the living and the dead to apportion everlasting weal or woe to each man. Christ, therefore, is the

1 See *Chr. Apology*, vol. II. ch. viii. Kuhn, *Einleitung in die Kathol. Dogmatick*, p. 117. Kleutgen, *Theol. der Vorzeit* III. 905. From a rationalistic point of view, the perfectibility of revealed religion is treated by Strauss, *Die Christliche Glaubenslehre*, Tübingen, 1840, I. 254. See on it, Hitzfelder, in *Kirchenlexicon*, I. Edit. xii. 942.

fulfilment of all prophecy. Hence John the Baptist, Christ's forerunner, who, as it were, stood on the threshold of the New Covenant without entering therein, proclaimed aloud that the Kingdom of God was at hand. In him—the last and greatest of the prophets—the prophetic spirit, which had long lain dormant, was revived, in order that a seal might be set to the work of the prophets. John's office was to point out Him whom all the prophets had foretold. His watchword in the wilderness, "Do penance, for the Kingdom of God is at hand," signalled the approach of the new king and the long-desired kingdom. Like an electric spark it fired the hearts of the faithful Israelites, and purified the sons of the Covenant for the coming of their God. Jesus Himself has set John above all the prophets, and called him the greatest of them that are born of women, significantly adding, however: "Yet he that is the lesser in the Kingdom of heaven is greater than he." "And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the Kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away. For all the prophets and the Law prophesied until John; and if you will receive it, he is Elias that is to come." (Matth. XI. 11–14). With John's summons to penance Christ joined a call to believe the Gospel: "The time is accomplished, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the Gospel." (Mark I. 15). Such, at least, is the sense Peter's disciple attaches to the words in Matth. IV. 17. And what was this Gospel? It was good tidings for the poor and the wretched, for publicans and sinners; the good tidings of redemption from sin, and death, and the devil; the good tidings that a new and imperishable Kingdom was to be set up, with Christ, the second Adam, as its head. Thus not only does Christ array His teaching in opposition to that of the Scribes and Pharisees, but He also far outstrips the entire range of the Old Testament, comparing and contrasting His authority with that of Moses, and declaring that He has come to fulfil all the Law and the Prophets, and to

give a new commandment of love, on the observance of which man's eternal salvation will depend. Nay, he goes still further, and places His commandments on the same footing as the Father's: "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall "enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the "will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the "Kingdom of heaven." (Matth. VII. 21). To Him the Father hath given to have life in Himself, and to give life and salvation to mankind. (Matth. XI. 27; Luke X. 22; John V. 26). Him the Father has constituted the all-seeing Judge of the world. Those whom He receives into favour shall live; those whom He spurns shall go into judgment. The blessed of His Father He will place in the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world; the accursed He will thrust into everlasting fire, "that all men may honour the Son, as they honour the Father." (John V. 23). "Every one therefore "that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him "before my Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny "me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is "in heaven." (Matth. X. 32, 33).

4. To the question what is meant by confessing or denying Christ before men, the Gospels give no uncertain answer. Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. In this truth lies, in the last instance, the supreme reason why the Christian revelation is absolute and final, and why Christ's laws and teaching are perfect and indestructible. "All things are "delivered to me by my Father. And no one knoweth the "Son, but the Father; neither doth any one know the Father, "but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal "Him." (Matth. XI. 27. Luke X. 22. John VI. 46; V. 37; VII. 28. 29; VIII 19; X. 15). He calls His Apostles blessed, because to them it was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. To His disciples, He said: "Blessed are "the eyes that see the things which you see. For I say to you "that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things

"that you see, and have not seen them; and to hear the things "that you hear, and have not heard them." (Luke x. 23. 24). As all power is given to Him in heaven and on earth, He can say to His Apostles: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations . . "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-"manded you . . . " (Matth. XXVIII. 19. 20). "He that "believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth "not, shall be condemned." (Mark XVI. 16). And again, He said that: "penance and remission of sins should be preached "in His name unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke XXIV. 45). Henceforth belief in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the one thing necessary. "He that believeth in the Son, "hath life everlasting, but he that believeth not the Son, shall "not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him." (John III. 36). "Amen, Amen I say unto you, that he who heareth my "word, and believeth Him who sent me, hath life everlasting, "and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death to "life." (John V. 24). "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh "my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in "the last day." (John VI. 54). "Christ is the resurrection and "the life." (XI. 25). "He is the way, and the truth and the "life. No one comes to the Father but by Him." (XIV. 6). "Now this is eternal life; that they may know Thee, the only "true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." (XVII. 3).

5. And now a further question arises: Is the knowledge imparted by the Son of God to remain ever the same? or will it be subject to modifications and variations? Can the foundation of our faith laid by Christ be supplanted by any other foundation? Can it be that Christ Himself promised His disciples that their knowledge should grow deeper, and their faith wax stronger? Holy Writ supplies the answer. For He promised to send the Holy Ghost, who would teach them all things, and bring to their minds all the things He had taught them. (John XIV. 26). For He had still many things to teach them, but they were too weak to bear them. "But when he,

"the Spirit of truth is come, he will teach you all truth . . "and the things that are to come he shall shew you." (XVI. 12, 13). Any difference, therefore, that there may be between the teaching of the Son and of the Spirit of God, will affect not the matter itself, but the understanding of the recipient. "For He shall not speak of Himself, but "what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak . . . "He shall glorify me, because He shall receive of mine, "and shall shew it to you. All things whatsoever the Fa-"ther hath, are mine. Therefore I said, that he shall re-"ceive of mine, and shew it to you. (XVI. 13–15.) The Holy Spirit is the Spirit both of Christ and of God. To the disciples He is the Paraclete, taking the place of Christ who had said : "Behold I am with you all days, even "unto the consummation of the world." (Matth. XXVIII. 20.) The truth of Christ and that of the Holy Spirit are the same, for Christ said : "Heaven and earth shall pass away, "but my words shall not pass away." (Luke XXI. 33).

6. In this way the Apostles understood their Master, in this spirit they conceived and exercised their office. Christ crucified and risen from the dead is their beginning and end, the subject-matter of their preaching, the foundation of their faith, the goal of their hopes. Before the Council S. Peter solemnly declares : "Neither is there salvation in "any other. For there is no other name under heaven "given to men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts IV. 12.) And S. Paul says : "There is one God and one mediator "of God and men, the man Jesus Christ : who gave Him-"self a redemption for all, a testimony in due times." (I Tim. II. 5-6 ; Gal. III. 20). The Old Covenant was temporary, and passed away with its fulfilment. The New Covenant, the Covenant of the spirit, not of the letter, remains for ever. "For if that which is done away is "glorious, much more that which remaineth is in glory." (II Cor. III. 11.)[a] The Kingdom of God in Christ is "an

[a] See also Rom. X. 4 ; Gal. III. 24-25.

"immovable Kingdom" (Heb. XII. 28); Christ's Priesthood is eternal (VII. 21-28). Christ is "Alpha and Omega, the "first and the last, the beginning and the end." (Apoc. I. 8).

The Apostles received from the Holy Ghost light and strength to understand the Gospel, to defend it against all comers, and to hand it on intact and entire to others. The Gospel they preached was not of their own fashioning; it was not the device of man, but the work of the Holy Ghost. And no man can set himself against the work of God without compassing his own destruction. When the Apostles were forbidden to preach, Peter and John simply answered that it was just to obey God rather than man (Acts IV. 19). S. Paul emphatically declares: "But though we or an "angel from heaven preach a Gospel to you besides that "which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. I. 8). "As we were approved by God that the Gos-"pel should be committed to us; even so we speak, not as "pleasing men, but God who proveth our hearts." (I Thess. II. 3). Mindful of the words our Lord had spoken to the Pharisees: "Every plant which my heavenly Father "hath not planted, shall be rooted up" (Matth. XV. 3), S. Paul bids the Corinthians remember that the Apostles are only the "ministers of him whom you have believed, and "to every one as the Lord hath given." . . . "God's coadjutors," as the faithful were "God's husbandry," and "God's building." (I Cor. III. 7–9; IV. 1).

In like manner, S. Paul strictly exacts from his disciples that they shall preach no other doctrine than that which they had received, that is, which Christ had revealed and the Apostles preached. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and "hold the traditions which you have learned, whether "by word or by our Epistle." (II Thess. II. 14). He repeatedly exhorts Timothy[3] neither to preach nor to allow others to preach a different doctrine; "to hold the form of "sound words," "to avoid the profane novelties of words,

3 I Tim. I. 3; IV. 6; VI. 20-21; II Tim. I. 13-14.

"and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called"; to guard what had been committed to his trust, and thus to stand firm in the faith and love of Jesus Christ. To the Ephesians he says: You are "built upon the foundations of the apostles "and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-"stone; in whom all the building, being formed together, "groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom also "you are built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Ephes. II. 20-22). The faithful, therefore, must be educated by Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists, Pastors and Doctors, so as to be built up into one body of Christ, "until "we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge "of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure "of the age of the fulness of Christ, that henceforth we be "no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with "every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by "cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Ephes. IV. 13-14).

7. The Church of the post-apostolic age, too, held fast to the principle that none but Apostolic doctrine was to be received as Christian. It clung to the pure and unadulterated Apostolic doctrine whole and entire, whether handed down by word of mouth or in writing. The rule laid down by the sacred authors in regard to their writings was written in lines of light for future guidance: "Keep what you have "received, without addition or diminution."[4] When the Montanists proclaimed the advent of a new era, the era of the Spirit, to which the Gospel was to succumb, as the Law had already succumbed to the Gospel, the Fathers loudly protested against such a preposterous innovation, devised solely in the interests of heresy. Two reasons were alleged by the Montanists in support of their opinion: the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the law of natural development. The descent of the Holy

4 Barnabas xix. 11. Vincent. Lerin. *Commonit.* c. 22. See Deut. iv. 2; Apoc. xxii. 18 seq.

Ghost, they argued, was as much the complement of the New Testament, as the coming of God the Son was the complement of the Old. This, they urged, was the meaning of the promised coming of the Holy Ghost. Men could not drink down all at once the full draught of Christian doctrine; they must imbibe it by degrees. All nature bends the knee to the law of gradual development. The plant springs up from the seed, and the tree grows out of the shrub.[5] Strange to say, however, Tertullian, in his Catholic days, had trampled down the very arguments with which he now seeks to bolster up the Montanist view. To the Gnostics, who alleged that the text "Seek and ye shall find" (Matth. VII. 7), favoured their error, Tertullian replies: "But there can be no indefinite seeking for that which "has been taught as one only definite thing. You must 'seek' "until you 'find,' and believe when you have found; nor have "you anything further to do, but to keep what you have "believed, provided you believe this besides, that nothing else "is to be believed, and, therefore, nothing else is to be sought, "after you have found and believed what has been taught by "him who charges you to seek no other thing than that which "he has taught. When, indeed, any man doubts about this, "proof will be forthcoming that we have in our possession that "which was taught by Christ."[6] The rule of faith, according to Tertullian, is one and unchangeable. Christ is all in all, and Christianity is the absolute religion. S. Augustine also denounced the presumption of those heretics, who supported their error with the plea that the Holy Spirit was to teach His friends many things that the disciples could not bear.

8. Thus the Church has ever been pervaded with the firm conviction that no new revelation is to be expected. Individuals, indeed, may receive a revelation from God; but such private revelations can never exercise a determining influence

5 Tertull., *De Virg.*, c. 1. *De Resurrect.*, cxiii.

6 Tertull., *De Præscript.* c. ix. (Clark's Translation). See also Kuhn l.c. p. 335, S. August. *In Joann.* 97, 2 seq.

upon the faith and morals of the universal Church. Nay, they are branded with the note of suspicion the moment they seem, even if it be but formally, to deviate from the Church's doctrine and practice. The Fathers fought might and main against those who, dissatisfied with the received rule of faith, were ever hankering after novelties and change; for a heaven-born religion needs to be revealed but once.[7] A departure from existing tradition is what the Apostle styles the "oppositions of knowledge falsely so called." Gregory the Great,[8] indeed, says that the portals of eternal wisdom will open wider, the nearer the end of the world approaches. But his words do not tell against what has been said. He, like the Apostles, says that the world is near its end, and he views the Christian era as a short epoch crowning the long ages of preparation and education through which mankind had passed. But Christianity, to complete and crown what had gone before, must assuredly be the highest revelation. Gregory, however, is comparing Christianity with the gradual revelation in the Old Testament, not one epoch of Christianity with another. Nor is it to the purpose to argue that some Scholastics, in discussing the difficulties about the Sacraments, contended that a later and special revelation had been vouchsafed to the Church It is true, they hazarded this as a possible hypothesis along with others; but Duns Scotus quickly demonstrated its utter untenableness, by pointing out that, as all revelation affecting the Church at large was concluded with the Apostles, the Church had no power to change the essence of a Sacrament.

This view of the matter is fully in harmony, not only with the nature, office and constitution of the Church, but also, more particularly, with the Scholastic teaching on the relations between Apostolic and ecclesiastical doctrine.[9] Progress,

7 Prov. xxii. 28; I Tim. vi. 20. See Kleutgen, III. 908-952.

8 *In Ezech.* II Homil. iv. 12. 'Quia quanto mundus ad extremitatem ducitur, tanto nobis aeternae scientiae aditus largius aperitur.' The New Testament, of course, awaits a new and more perfect revelation, as S. Gregory says (ib. n. 15), but that is the great revelation of the beatific vision. Tr.

9 See Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte der Mittlerenzeit.* Freiburg, 1882, iii. p. 498, 513.

indeed, there must be, says Albertus Magnus; but it is rather the progress of the believer in faith, than of faith in the believer. S. Thomas states in the clearest language, that our faith rests on the revelation made to the Prophets and Apostles, not on that made to any other teachers.[10] And he bases his statement on the well-known dictum of S. Augustine: "Only to the books of Scripture that are called canonical have "I learnt to pay such reverence as to firmly believe that none "of their authors has erred in anything." In other words, only the inspired authors were infallible in everything. Bellarmine also bears witness to the Church's doctrine on this head. The Church of God, he says, is no longer guided by new revelations, but she holds fast to that which has been delivered to her by the ministers of the word. Hence she is said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.[11]

9. In saying, however, that Christian Revelation was completed and closed with the Apostles, and that *it* admits of no objective and material additions or alterations, we are by no means denying a *formal* perfectibility. Christian revelation though absolute truth, was not given in an absolutely perfect form. This, considering the imperfections inherent in human language and man's limited capacity, was impossible. In revelation, God comes down to man's level. Christ adapted His discourses to the intelligence of His hearers. He expounded divine truth, not only in human thought and language, but in a particular form, viz. in parables. He saw, how slow and dull the disciples were to understand the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, and the divine plan of redemption. He sent the Holy Ghost to open out their understanding, and to give them more insight; but even so their knowledge still remained broken and refracted. "For we know in part and

10 S. Thom. I. q. I. a. 8 ad 2; II. II. q. clxxii. a. 6 ad 1. Albertus M. III Dist. 25. a. 1 ad 1. S. Aug. Ep. xix. 1 ad Hieron.

11 *De Verbo Dei*, iv. 9.

we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is "come, that which is in part, shall be done away . . . 'We see now through a glass in a dark manner, but then 'face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall know "even as I am known." (1 Cor. XIII. 9-12). The Apostles, though filled with the Divine Spirit that searcheth even the deep things of God, had to impart divine truth to men through the medium of human ideas and human language. No harm was thereby done to the absolute truth and matter of revelation, because the natural truths in the human mind, besides being necessarily true, are likewise indispensable as a foundation on which to rear the edifice of a higher religious knowledge which, since it is revealed, does not trespass on matters that are the object of the several branches of human science, but stands unmoved amid the ever fluctuating conditions of human knowledge. All that is required as a foundation, is the natural light of reason, and the religious and moral disposition implanted in man. Thus divine revelation is part of the mental life of man, and as such cannot but be capable of formal perfectibility or development.

10. We have to consider, furthermore, that God the Son, in becoming man, breathed into humanity a new vital principle which was destined to work a marvellous change. Progress and perfection were to be the law set not for individuals alone, but for the whole organism whose head is Christ. Christ Himself has illustrated the principle in the parable of the seed that grew into a tree. Perhaps it may be argued, that this parable has reference merely to the external growth and development of the Kingdom of Christ that was to spread over the whole world. But the same objection cannot be urged against the parable of the leaven. Here the whole mass as such is saturated and transformed. Not merely individual believers, but the whole body of believers, as a community, are leavened. To the Apostles, as witnesses of Christ's resurrection, and as the living embodiment of His words and works, the divine Spirit was first

given. Without this infallible Spirit, they could not have preached Christ's doctrine pure and undefiled. And, if the Apostolic preaching was to be preserved intact and unadulterated, it was equally necessary that their successors should inherit the like divine gift. Now this infallible Spirit, like the spirit of man, is living and active, and vivifies and quickens the whole body. At all times it pervades the whole life of the Church. And thus the Church unfolds her faith as the need arises, and applies it under ever varying circumstances. Thus her doctrines expand and develop day by day. The difference between the Patristic and Montanist teaching did not consist in denying on the one hand, and affirming on the other, that the Holy Spirit abides in the Church and aids in its development. On the contrary, the Fathers lifted up their voice in protest, because the Montanists claimed for themselves a special Paraclete who had only just come; a Paraclete, who had not been abiding in the Church from the beginning, and who was teaching new doctrines that were at variance with the faith and life heretofore existing in the Church.

11. Nor were the Apostles unaware of this law of progress They exhort the faithful to grow in the knowledge of Christ,[18] that they may all be built up into a perfect man. They entreat them to put to good use the gifts received, that God may finish the work He had begun. That they themselves were conscious of advancing in the knowledge of divine truth, a glance at S. Paul's Epistles will abundantly prove. In all his Epistles, the truths set forth are substantially the same. Yet how vastly the Epistles written during his captivity differ in character and tone from the earlier ones, especially those addressed to the Romans and Galatians! Again, the so-called pastoral Epistles exhibit the practical side of their author. Some writers exaggerate these differences with a view to challenging S. Paul's authorship, while others, with the contrary purpose, have pared away both sides and left nothing in the middle. Both processes are needless,

18. Ephes. iv. 13; Coloss. i. 10; II Peter, iii. 18.

for the differences, though real, are only formal, not material. Then again, S. John's Gospel, in comparison with the Synoptists and S. Paul, also reveals progress. Each of the Catholic Epistles, too, has its own peculiarities. Here we need only remind the reader of the idea of Christian hope as set forth in S. Peter's first Epistle, and of the relation in which S. James' Epistle stands to Romans. Latterly a great deal has been said, in an exaggerated strain, of the peculiar doctrinal concepts of the New Testament writers. Still there is no denying that in the manner of conceiving, propounding and applying the fundamental truths of Christianity, a clear stream of progress is discernible. The Apostles, assuredly, were not automatic witnesses of our Lord's sayings and doings. They were not merely passive organs of the Holy Ghost, but they had an intellectual grasp of revealed truth. The Holy Ghost while guiding them to acquire a deeper knowledge of the divine dispensation, and to impart that knowledge to the faithful, was thereby confirming and strengthening their faith.

12. The post-apostolic age entered upon the full inheritance of Christian revelation, both written and oral, that the Apostles had preached and taught. But the Apostolic teaching was not a systematised body of doctrine, nor yet a mere conglomerate of words and deeds without internal connexion, which the human mind was left to understand and explain, as best it might, with its own lights. True, the revelation bequeathed to the Church by the Apostles was conceived in the common forms of the human mind, and expressed in the language and according to the needs of the times; but from this it does not follow that these forms were to be exposed to the changes and ever shifting influences that girdle human science. We must beware of two excesses: either of supposing that the Church became conscious only by slow degrees of the contents of revelation, or that she had been fully conscious of all its dogmas from the beginning. For the first view would fail to do justice both to the contents of the New Testament

writings, and to the faith and life of the ancient Church; while the latter would shut out from sight the historical development of such dogmas as the Trinity and Unity of God, the Incarnation and Person of Christ, and the salvation of mankind by God's grace.

Now such historical development is inconceivable except under two conditions: first, that the various aspects of the dogma, subsequently set out in clear light, were already contained, somehow or other, in revelation and in the previous teaching of the Church; and second, that the Church had not from the outset a clear and full view of all these different aspects, and of all the different bearings of the dogma. We must not suppose that development was wholly brought about by wicked heretics. Nor again can we account for it by supposing that certain truths had been blotted out from the memory of later generations. Such a supposition is as unreasonable as it is incompatible with the principle of Tradition on which the whole fabric of faith rests. On the contrary, development is and must be due to causes that are at work within the Church. Ignorance and doubt may at times cloud the minds of the faithful and good, because new questions concerning faith may arise, as time goes on. And were not heretics, too, sometimes in a position to prop up their heresy by singling out passages from Scripture or the Fathers? Not all things in Scripture and Tradition are written in lines of light. Melchior Canus mentions the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, the Beatific Vision, the Immaculate Conception, the Sacraments, and the doctrine of the nature and privileges of the Church as problems, the solution of which is not unmistakably clear from Scripture or Tradition.

13. Holy Scripture is adapted, in a wonderful manner, to give a permanent form to the contents of revelation. Its language and manner of thought, it is true, are borrowed from a particular people, the Semitic and Hellenistic Jews; but these are an accidental and transient factor which leaves the

thoughts and substance untouched; and they are consequently matters of less importance, and lie, as it were, on the confines of faith and science. But, for this very reason, the Church, when defining doctrines of faith, has ever been reluctant to deviate from the letter of Holy Scripture. In questions about God and divine things, the Fathers often remark that we must believe nothing but what is in the Scriptures. "For, concerning the divine and sacred mysteries," says S. Cyril of Jerusalem, "nothing whatever is to be set "forth without the sacred Scriptures, nor may we yield to "clever persuasion or artful words. For the power of faith "that worketh salvation comes not from proofs from reason, "howsoever cleverly put, but from proofs from Holy Scripture." From Pseudo-Dionysius, too, the well-head of Scholasticism, the saying has passed current among the Scholastics, that no one may say or think concerning the Godhead aught but what God Himself has revealed in the sacred Books. Before him S. Basil had said. "Believe what is written, and be not "inquisitive about things unwritten." And the reason for this extreme caution is given by S. Augustine: "In disputing "about matters so thickly obscure, human reason must hold "back when the proofs from Scripture are not clear and "certain."[13]

Nevertheless, these and such like passages from the Fathers refer directly to the mysteries, and hence they cannot be applied generally to the whole cycle of the doctrines of faith. They were designed to warn off human ingenuity from tampering with the revealed mysteries, not to stunt these and other doctrines of the faith in their legitimate growth, which takes place under the authority of the Church and with the assistance of the Holy Ghost. Nay, when change of circumstances gave rise to concrete questions about faith and morals, such development grew into a necessity. When the Christian faith was

13. See Petavius, *Prolegomena* i. 7. M. Canus, *Loci Theol.* iii. 1. Roesler, *Der Kathol. Dichter A. Prudentius Clemens.* Freiburg, 1886, p. 318.

first preached, the several Christian communities had but few wants. Controversies, such as they were, hinged upon the question whether Christianity were preferable to Judaism and Heathenism. The Christian religion found its immediate expression, not in the theorizings and intellectual speculations of the learned, but in the virtue and life of the Church. But as time went on, Christianity came in closer contact with heathenism, and proportionately its opposition to worldly wisdom waxed louder and stronger. Then the several tenets of faith had to be strengthened against all incursions of doubt from within and from without. Misconceptions and misrepresentations had to be guarded against. And thus the continuous progressive movement imparted to the Church's faith and worship is really due to the combined action of two forces: the attacks of heretics, and that tendency towards development which is inherent in all living faith.

To the objection that Christianity was an unnecessary innovation, the Apologists, as we have seen in an earlier volume, made a twofold reply. In the first place, they claimed for Christianity a greater antiquity than idolatry and philosophy, because the preparation for Christianity began in the Old Testament, and the natural knowledge of God was an indispensable condition of revelation. In the second place, they urged that progress is an innate law in all things human, religious life included. To stand still in religion, is to go back. If religion is permeated by a living spirit, if the God-man dwells in His Church, then, however final and absolute Christianity be as a religion, its doctrines must be instinct with life and movement, progress and development. But conservatism must go hand in hand with progress.

14. In discussing this question, it is usual to refer to the celebrated *Commonitorium* of S. Vincent of Lerins, and to follow up his line of argument. S. Vincent emphasizes both conservatism and progress, and shews that the two are mutually and internally connected. And firstly, he lays it down as

absolutely certain, that all revealed truth is to be traced back in an unbroken line to the Apostles. "*Quod semper, quod ubique, et ab omnibus*," is his rule. In a word, only that is to be held as an article of faith which all men, in all parts of the world, have at all times believed. It is not our present purpose to explain this famous saying in detail; we merely quote it as pointing the dagger at innovations in faith. S. Vincent then goes on to ask: Is progress, which is present in all things else, absent from religion? Is religion the only exception to the law of progress? In the Catholic Church, he answers, the progress of religion is very great. Is there any man, he asks so mean and hateful in God's sight, as to dare to block it? But, be it noted, he insists that it be really and truly progress, and not change. By progress things are unfolded and expand; whereas change turns one thing into something else quite different. Hence the Church and all its members must ever be growing in knowledge and wisdom and understanding, according to times and circumstances. But they must grow in the same doctrines, in the same meaning and sense, so that while the manner is new, the thing itself is unchanged (*nove, non nova*).[14]

15. S. Vincent illustrates his meaning by an analogy from the growth of organisms. Spiritual development is governed by the same laws as organic development. As years roll by, the human body grows and develops, but it is ever essentially one and the same. The youth differs from the man, but whether young or old he is the same man. So, in like manner, the tree is other than the shrub, and the shrub is not the seed, yet both tree and shrub have grown out of the seed. From these comparisons it is clear that S. Vincent was not debarred by the absolute, final and unchangeable character of revelation from holding that religious growth and development are the law both in individuals and the Church at large. And he does not merely mean, that they grow in the knowledge that

14 *Commonitorium* c. 28.

springs from faith, or that the dogmas of faith become more fully understood,[15] but that there is real progress in religion itself. In a word, he means that the Church's doctrinal teaching, not merely its theology, or science of faith, is progressive. Dogmas fixed and formulated in later times were not taught clearly and explicitly in the early ages, but only implicity and obscurely, and in general terms. Were it otherwise, the Church's teaching could neither progress nor develop.

Scientific theology and ecclesiastical teaching, far from being in opposition, are mutually correlated, as we may see from the influence wielded in the Western Church by S. Augustine and S. Thomas. Still they are not identical. We must beware of supposing that the teaching Church *(Ecclesia Docens)* is a blind tool in the hands of theology for raising to the rank of a dogma the one theological opinion, from among the many, that seems at the time to be most in harmony with revelation. On the contrary, she consistently follows her own course of development, and thus arrives at the decision that is, for the time being, best calculated to grapple with error and misunderstandings, and to give instruction and edification to the faithful. As theology is the pioneer of ecclesiastical teaching, so it, in turn, is piloted by the authoritative teaching of the Church. The various dogmatic decisions issued by the Church upon one and the same point of faith, while encircling the truth with light, and giving a spurt to theology, have ever kept pace with the progress of human science. In her decisions the Church has scrupulously adhered, as far as may be, to the words and phrases of Scripture; but this only proves that she avoids new terms, lest she should incur the slightest suspicion of innovation. The very necessity of new definitions also shows the extreme difficulty of giving, at all times, adequate positive expression to the faith of the Church. Were these definitions framed for no other purpose than to determine more precisely the true sense of God's word, they would be rendering no mean service.

15 Kleutgen iii. 968.

The comparison of the Church with a living organism is as old as the Church herself. S. Paul, as we have seen, insists on it repeatedly and at length. The Church, he says, grows and expands, both within and without, yet never becomes a different body. Its life, grace and energy flow from Jesus Christ, its head; while all its truth and strength are derived from the Divine Spirit animating it. But a Church, with Christ and the Divine Spirit as head and soul, must needs grow, both in extent and intensity, in intellectual and moral life. How could she otherwise repel hostile encroachments from without, and beat down human frailty within? Thust he struggle for self-preservation, and the fight to keep all that she has received, becomes to the Church a means of continuous progress in faith and sanctity.

16. It is this unique combination of conservatism with progress, this double action in at once keeping intact and yet ever developing the faith committed to her, that distinguishes the Catholic Church from all other communions. In this she differs from the rationalistic school, which simply looks upon the Apostolic deposit as a form of cognition moulded to suit the early ages; from those Christian communities (e.g., the Greek) which conceive tradition as a stagnant pool; and again from Protestants, who wish to go back to the initial stage of the first centuries, and, as it were, to force the whole stream of social and moral development back to its source. Even Strauss ridicules this absurdity: "To stand still and adhere slavishly "to what is written in matters of faith and morals, as some "teachers, mostly of the school of Antioch, have recommended, "is merely to bury the talent that should be put out at interest. "By its very nature the human mind cannot but seek to know "more precisely what is only indefinitely contained in Scrip- "ture, and also to transform (!) and adapt what is no longer "suitable to changed times and circumstances. Of course the "Church was only conscious of the former operation."[16]

16 *Glaubenslehre* I. 108. See Kuhn, *Einleitung* p. 130.

Rationalists assume that Christianity is capable of infinite material perfectibility, while the orthodox Protestant theory, with its irrational supernaturalism, denies all development. Under other conditions, both would be right; the latter, were there no living Spirit at work in the Church; the former, if supernatural revelation were not final, and if it were without an infallible interpreter. But since these suppositions are false, the two theories built upon them are also false. Supernatural revelation, though absolute and final, may be given in a finite form, and only the Spirit that gave it, can infallibly expound it and make it fruitful for all ages and climes.*

17. Hence progress and development are a necessity in the Church, and they are due, as we have said, to two causes: heresies from without, and a desire to understand the faith from within. Were the latter wanting, the former would force the Church to develop. Heresies are often regarded as mere abortions or monsters, the products of giddy minds or depraved wills, as, indeed, they sometimes are; but they were not always so, especially in the first centuries. At times they derived partial support from doctrines and institutions previously in existence; and the error lay in giving too much prominence to one side of the dogma, and unduly disregarding the other.[17] Once the ball of contradiction was set rolling, it was sure to give a start to many aberrations

18. While lashing heresies with all their might, the Fathers recognized their negative worth as indirect aids in shedding light on revealed truth. In this sense, from Tertullian onwards, they were wont to explain I Cor. XI. 19: "There must needs "be heresies." Heresies prompt deeper enquiry into Christian truths, and cause them to be more fully explained. Heresy, remarks Tertullian, may be a bugle-call to the Doctors of

17 Hagemann, *Die Römische Kirche*, Freiburg, 1864, p. 21.

* It is interesting to see how the greatest witness to the Catholic faith in the 19th century, the late Cardinal Newman, long before he became a Catholic, had fully realized the truth that development was a necessary mark of the true Church, and that development, to be sure and safe, demanded, as a collateral factor, a divine and authoritative exponent of the faith. Tr.

the Church, summoning them to develop a doctrine anew, or it may be a chastisement on them for neglecting the duty of development. To Origen heresy seems the necessary resultant of the contact of two forces: divine truth with the human mind. "When the working and serving classes, and "men of culture in Greece, began to perceive something "venerable in Christianity, heresies became inevitable, both "by reason of the lust of dispute and contradiction, and of the "desire of the learned to penetrate deeper into the Christian "mysteries." S. Augustine also says that heresies, by forcing upon the Church particular questions, have thereby caused the Sacred Scriptures to be studied more diligently than they would otherwise have been. From personal experience he learnt that understanding of the faith may be sharpened, deepened, and perfected by opposition. He confesses that Pelagianism, besides forcing him to study God's word more attentively, made him a defender of grace. Had not Semi-pelagianism arisen, he says, the question, how faith begins, would perhaps have never occurred to him, or he might have thought wrongly concerning it. The heresy, however, helped to open his eyes, and was the occasion of his writing his retractations. But he begs his opponents, when judging his doctrine, or that of the early Fathers on grace, to bear in mind the doctrine he is combating, in the face of which he is striving to defend some Christian truth.[18]

19. The history of the Church, from the very beginning, also bears witness that heresy has been indirectly instrumental in unfolding Catholic doctrine. The judaïzing school in Galatia prompted S. Paul to show that the New Testament was superior to the Old, and to explain more exactly the necessity and power of faith working through charity. By the disputes and schisms that were rife in Corinth, he was led to draw out

18 Tertull. *De Praescript*, c. 39. Orig. *C. Cels*, iii. 12. Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xvi. 2, 1. *Enarr. in Ps.* 55, 22; *Epist.* 143, 2. *De dono persev.* xxi. 55. *Retract. Prol.* n. 2. Cf. Petav. *De Poen.* ii. 7, 2. Kleutgen, iii. 883, 955. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 166.

in detail the relation subsisting between the charismata and the one God and one Lord. The dangers lurking in Rome and other churches induced him to proclaim aloud his Gospel and Apostolic office. So, again, the errors of the Gnostics and Manichæans made it incumbent on defenders of the faith to adjust the bearings between redemption and creation, and to state in what relation God stands to the world and to evil.[19] The Gnostics, according to some modern writers, were the first dogmatic theologians and biblical scholars. To them we owe, they say, the first attempt to reduce the faith to system, and to fix the canon.[20] Ecclesiastical decisions, indeed, are often slow and late in coming; but this is the natural and inevitable course of Catholic development. The struggle surging within the Church, on the rise of heresy, is preparing the way for them. Thus, on the dispute concerning the validity of heretical baptism S. Augustine remarks: "How could a "subject, so wrapped up in the mists of controversy, have "been encircled with a halo of light by a plenary council, "unless bishops in different parts of the world have previ-"ously met in consultation and worked the problem out?"[21] It may be frankly conceded that at times individual apologists, while assuming the common truth to be self-evident, confronted error with its extreme, thus, as it were, taking pattern by the gardener who tries to make a stormblown tree straight by bending it in the opposite direction. To defend what all admitted and none denied were to waste both time and labour. But the Church herself has ever avoided extremes in her decisions, as we may see from her attitude towards the doctrine of grace as advocated by S. Augustine.[22]

20. This development, the causes of which we have assigned in the preceding pages, is still traceable, at least in the chief

19 Moehler, *Symbolick*, p. 371. Hagemann, p. 19.

20 Kuhn, p. 332. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I. p. 188.

21 *De Bapt.*, II. 12 seq. Kleutgen, III. 976 seq.

22 See Kuhn, *Einleitung*, p. 161 seq.

doctrines of faith, and in the life of the Church. As a rule, we can indicate the main stages through which it has passed. Broadly speaking, they correspond or coincide with the very points that the Church's decisions have subsequently made clear, as may be seen by a glance at the Apostles' Creed, the Creeds of Nicæa and Chalcedon, and the so-called Athanasian (Anastasian?) Creed. In them we see, as in a mirror, the course that development has run in regard to two main dogmas, the Theological and the Christological, as they are called, which are both unmistakably contained in Holy Scripture. The Theological dogma, or that concerned with the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, while supposing that the Godhead is absolutely one, teaches that the Son and Holy Ghost, and not the Father alone, are each truly God. The attack on these truths proceeded from the various sections of what is known as the Monarchist heresy.* Hence the Church was summoned to do battle and to buckle on her armour in defence of the whole truth. She was obliged not only to emphasize the distinction between Father and Son, but also to state in what relation the divine persons stand to the divine nature and to one another. Against the Sabellian Modalists she defended the real Trinity of persons; against the Arians she declared that the Son is consubstantial with the Father; against the Pneumatomachi she taught that the Holy Ghost is God equally with the Father and Son. Moreover, she taught that the distinction of persons rests on the acts of generation and procession. Nothing now remained but to define more exactly the relation between the Son and the Holy Ghost, and this was accomplished by the declaration that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both Father and Son *(ab utroque)*. Thus the Western Church, in conflict indeed with the Greek Church, but in perfect harmony with Holy Scripture, gave the finishing stroke to the dogmatic development of this fundamental truth.

* So called, because of their motto: "We believe in a Monarchy," i.e. in one nature and one person. In their view the Son and Holy Ghost were either mere names for the same person (Modalists), or they were inferior in rank and being (Arians). Tr.

The process in regard to the Christological dogma was very similar. The struggle raged with equal fierceness, when Ebionites and Docetists* sounded the clarion of war, the one leading the attack on the divinity, the other on the real humanity of Christ. Difficult as the task of reconciling the two may have seemed, it was the Church's bounden duty to defend the two natures, perfect and entire, in the one Christ. Nor did the struggle end there. It lasted for centuries. Arianism, of which we have already spoken, pitted the divine unity against a real Trinity. This was its cardinal error. Then by holding that Christ was verily a distinct person from the Father, but had not the same divine nature, it denied two perfect natures in Christ. Next Apollinaris reinforced the Arian attack by depriving the human nature of a human soul, the place of which he supplied with the Λόγος. And now development entered on a further stage. Belief in Christ's two natures opened out a new vista of questions; to wit the union of the natures. Nestorius taught that the two were united morally and externally only, thus implying a twofold person. Eutyches and the Monophysites, on the contrary, taught that the two natures were blent in one confusion, one being completely absorbed in the other. This long struggle issued in the definition that in the one person of the Logos are two natures, entire and perfect, distinct and not confused (*una persona in duabus naturis*). Yet again the cry to arms resounded throughout Christendom, when some sought to tone down the definition by contending that Christ had only one will and one energy. These last combatants were the Monothelites,† who were driven from the field by the Sixth General Council. Thus heresies were the means of developing the Catholic Christology. To some it will seem surprising that these fundamental dogmas, so clearly and explicitly set forth in the faith of the Church, in

* Docetists (δοκεῖν to seem), so called because they taught that Christ had only seemingly not really a human body. Tr.

† Monothelites (μόνον θέλημα), so called because they taught that Christ had only one will, the divine, and no human will. Tr.

Holy Writ and Tradition, should have become the object of controversies that stirred the Eastern world to its depths, and should have been fully developed only after long and bitter struggles. But if we look beneath the surface, we shall see that these struggles were deadly duels between faith and philosophy, between divine wisdom and human reason, between true and false development. Heretics sought to confine faith within the prison bars of reason, while the Church tried to accommodate reason to faith, and to widen the categories of reason with the help of revelation. Hence, in her definitions, the Church could appeal to both Scripture and Tradition, whereas heretics had to readjust their instruments of proof. So at least Tertullian seems to say: "There, then, must the corruption both of the "Scriptures and the expositions thereof be regarded as existing, "where diversity of doctrine is found. On those, whose "purpose it was to teach differently, lay the necessity of "differently arranging the instruments of doctrine,"[23] (i.e. the Scriptures, especially of the N.T.). And again, the author of the "Little Labyrinth' (Hippolytus?) refers the Artemonites to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, that is to Tradition, in order to show that Christ was worshipped as God.

21. And here it may seem that, on the whole, or at all events in particular doctrines, the process of dogmatic development has reached its final stage and come to a standstill. This is the view taken by Protestants who allow the oldest creeds to be an accurate expression of the doctrines of Scripture, but set their face against all further development in Christian doctrine. The Council of Ephesus, by commanding under pain of anathema that no creed but that of Nicæa[24] should be used, seems to lend support to this view. But how

23 Tertullian, *De Præscript.* c. 37, 38, (Clark's Translation). On the Labyrinth see Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* v. 28. Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Callistus.* Regensburg, 1853, p. 3 seq. Kuhn *Die Christliche Lehre von der göttlichen Dreieinigkeit.* Tübingen, 1857, p 306.

24 Mansi, iv, p. 1358. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2nd edit. ii. 207.

slender and fragile a prop this is to lean upon, is seen from the fact that the Council of Chalcedon, after approving the Nicene symbol, together with Cyril's explanations given at Ephesus, proceeded forthwith to expand the teaching concerning the union of the two natures in the one person. Hence S. Thomas says, that the prohibition "was aimed at "private persons, who have no business to fix the faith; but "it was not meant to prevent a subsequent synod from issuing "a new edition of the creed that should throw more light "on one and the same faith. And so each synod, owing to "the exigencies of heresy, has been a step in advance of its "predecessor."[25] An example of this apparently inconsistent action on the part of the Church is furnished by the history of the *Filioque*. These words were first inserted in a creed at Toledo (447), but only found their way into the symbol of Nicæa and Constantinople in 589. Nevertheless the Roman Church, however convinced that the words adequately expressed the true faith, was unwilling to act against even the letter of the prohibition, and consequently refused to ratify the addition for several centuries. And when at length it was inserted, the Greeks reproached Rome with falsifying the Creed! Rome has retained in her liturgy the Apostles' Creed together with the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople; and yet the Greeks, who have completely lost the Apostles' Creed, accuse Rome of tampering with the symbol of faith! Is not this surpassing strange? Surely they forget that the definitions of Councils need explanation and development as much as the doctrines of Scripture.

22. How is it possible for the living spirit in the Church ever to become inactive? The life of faith in the Church can never sink down to a "dead level of monotony." To say nothing of the spread of Christianity among the nations, which ever makes fresh demands on the Church's teaching office and work, the very progress of general education, the springing

25 S. Thom. II. II. Qu. I. a. 10. ad 2.

up of new heresies, or the reappearance of old heresies under new forms, compel theologians to study the dogmas more deeply, and the Church to define them more clearly. Dogmatic truth is divine and consequently inexhaustible. Reason, on the other hand, being a living force, is by nature ceaseless in its activity. And hence the same eternal and unchangeable truths both can and must develop.

23. An instance in point is the dogma of redemption. Holy Writ states emphatically that we are saved by the *grace* of Christ. In what relation, however, does grace stand to good works? What bearing have good works on justifying faith? What connection has grace with the Sacraments? In answer to these questions Holy Scripture supplies certain data, but it does not answer them clearly and directly. At the outset there was no complete systematic treatise on Grace or the Sacraments. The Greek Fathers, trained in Greek wisdom, after the manner of their masters in philosophy, were wont to speak of virtue firstly and chiefly as the work of man. Gnostic and Manichæan Dualism made it still more imperative on theologians to urge that man is free to determine the course that his actions shall take. Hence their writings are coloured by phrases that tone down the necessity of grace as a principle preceding all man's endeavours to attain salvation. But when the Pelagians set liberty on a higher pinnacle than grace, and proclaimed that the Christian religion was not a positive means given to man to attain a supernatural end, but only a moral means of attaining his natural end more easily, S. Augustine who, when arguing against the Manichæans, had placed human liberty in the van, was compelled to thrust it into the rear in order to give prominence to the absolute necessity of divine grace. He saw clearly that the very first beginning of faith, that is the sinner's first wish to believe, must be ascribed to grace and not, as the Semipelagians held, to the effort made by the sick man in desiring to obtain help from a physician. Thus Augustine

threw a mantle of light over the whole question of grace, and cleared the ground for the Church's decrees against the Pelagians and Semipelagians. Nor was this all. That controversy failed to settle all questions, for even now there are many awaiting solution. Even the keenest and brightest intellects stand perplexed in presence of the problem raised by the manner in which grace acts through free-will. These the Apostolic See has left undecided, and for the present abandoned to the turmoil of theological discussion. Again, the controversy on heretical baptism, by eliciting that the effect did not depend on the character of the minister, partially solved the question of sanctifying grace as conferred by the Sacraments. Nevertheless the same controversy broke out afresh in one form or another in the Middle Ages, and finally, in the XVI century, the whole question of grace was reopened by the Reformers who, in opposition to all existing teaching, propounded a brand new doctrine on justification and the Sacraments, which obliged the Church to give full and explicit expression to her teaching in the Council of Trent.

Closely linked with the Sacraments is the doctrine concerning the Church. The Reformers, by placing each individual in direct relationship to Christ by faith, and by promising salvation without the Church's intervention, denied authority to the Church as a visible Divine institution, and thereby cut the ground from under her as a means and condition of salvation. In effect they decried the Church set up by Christ as the Kingdom of Antichrist. And as that great revolt still endures and, leagued with the spirit and errors of Rationalism, is still battering at the faith and authority of the Church, the Church, as in duty bound, has in the Vatican Council given a further development to her doctrines on the nature and authority of the Church.

23. The Cultus and Liturgy of the Church furnish yet another instance of doctrinal development, not indeed directly, but only indirectly, because of their connection with the

doctrines they symbolize. Nevertheless, as is easily understood, development in this sphere is naturally greater and more notable than in the domain of faith and doctrine, because, besides being the worship of God, Liturgy is intended to raise man up to God, by bringing into play the elements of sense and reason, and thus stirring up the spiritual influences lying dormant within him. Christian Liturgy has its foundations laid deep down in Scripture and Tradition. Our Lord Himself taught the disciples how to pray; He Himself instituted the sacrifice of the new and eternal Testament, and commanded His Apostles to do it in memory of Him; He Himself instituted the Sacraments, some of which, Baptism and Confirmation for example, used to be administered with the Holy Eucharist. Again, Christ's words: "*nolite dare sanctum canibus, neque mittatis margaritas ante porcos*" (Matth. VII. 6), besides prompting the disciples to withdraw sacred things from the profane, also taught them to treat these sacred things with the greatest reverence.

The faithful in Jerusalem, we learn from the Acts, assembled together to break bread. This breaking of bread became to them a solemn divine service, in other words, a liturgical action. They met, S. Paul tells us, on the first day of the week (Sunday). S. Paul's directions about the celebration of the Lord's Supper point to a regular divine service. Furthermore, from his epistles it would seem that hymns and edifying discourses added to the solemnity. ". . . Be ye filled," he says, "with the Holy Spirit. Speaking to yourselves in "psalms and hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making "melody in your hearts to the Lord: Giving thanks always for "all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God and "the Father." (Ephes. V. 18-20; Col. III. 16).* Do not the

* It may be urged that these words refer to private life, not to public worship. That they refer directly to private life may be granted, but the Apostle borrowed the words from the divine service which sets forth Christian life in its perfection, and of which private life ought to be a copy. And thus his words bear indirectly on the Liturgy. Tr.

following words also sound like part of a liturgical hymn? "And evidently great is the mystery of piety which was "manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, appeared "to angels, hath been preached to the Gentiles, is believed in "the world, is taken up in glory."[26]

From these indications we may fairly infer that, even in Apostolic times, the liturgy had been considerably developed not only in the communities of Jewish Christians, who retained their own usages and forms of prayer, but also among Gentile Christians. In the post-apostolic Churches these ordinances of the Apostles continued in force, and received still further development, as we learn from several historical documents and from the old Liturgies, which emanated in substance from the Apostles whose names they bear. Pliny the Younger, in his letter to Trajan, distinctly asserts that the Christians met on a certain day before sunrise and sang hymns to Christ their God. Eusebius also states that, in his time, the faithful were still wont to sing canticles, handed down from the early Christians, in which they honoured Christ as God.[27]

From the writings of Justin, and the recently discovered Διδαχή, we gather that divine worship centred in the reading of Scripture and the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. The liturgical prayer of thanks (εὐχαριστία) contained the Apostolic rule of faith, and hence was called the Canon. Speaking of the liturgy of his time, Tertullian invokes Tradition on its behalf, saying that it originated in Tradition, was observed in faith, and was ratified by constant use. The Fathers by affirming that usages in the Church, not historically traceable to positive institution, have come down from the Apostles, recognize Tradition as their leading principle. Not that they were unaware that cultus and liturgy had undergone development since Apostolic times. But they knew that these were a natural growth from the seeds sown by the Apostles. From

26 I Tim. iii. 16.
27 H. E. v. 28 (32, 5). See *Christian Apology* II. c. vii.

the fundamental Christian mysteries, as it were from a root, have sprung up the many branches and fragrant flowers of the liturgy. As these mysteries bear chiefly on our Lord's life, they naturally issued in a corona of feasts which, as the year runs its course, call to mind Christ and the redemption that He accomplished. In this way arose feasts in honour of our Lord and the martyrs, to which were added others in honour of the Apostles and the Blessed Virgin, which gave new life and solemnity to the divine liturgy.

25. And here we may be allowed to point out once more how the Catholic Church differs from other communions in this matter. The first great liturgical dispute, that, namely, concerning the celebration of Easter, seems to show that the Eastern Church began to regard Tradition as a dead principle. Nowhere had the liturgy developed so rapidly and so richly as in the Greek Church, which was, in an especial manner, the liturgical Church. But the vigorous life that at first pulsated in her liturgical veins soon ceased to flow, and then she became listless and shrivelled up into a skeleton of antique forms. What avails her boast of having preserved the most ancient traditions, if life and energy have gone out of them? The conservative principle, as understood or rather misunderstood by her, has dammed the stream of progress in theology, worship and discipline. What a different sight meets our eyes in the Catholic Church. How beautifully the old blends with the new in her worship! Like an evergreen planted by the side of the running waters, the living Church is ever sending forth new offshoots. But however varied its manifestations, however new at first blush they often seem, they have all grown out of the tree planted by the Apostles, and have derived their nourishment from the life-force that has animated Catholic worship for centuries.[28] Of a truth, in comparing modern

[28] *Doctrina Ap.* c. 9. Justin, *Ap.* i., 65, 67. See Krauss *Real-Encyclopädie ii.* 311–313. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær* iii., 3, 8; Tertull., *De Cor*, c. 4, *Adv. Marc*, iv., 5. Probst, *Liturgie, &c.*, Tübingen, 1870. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der Kathol. Liturgik*, Freiburg, 1883, 1887.

worship with the worship of the first two centuries, or in tracing modern liturgy to its rise and early growth, we cannot fail to notice a manifold diversity side by side with resemblance in main outline. But in this, even more than in doctrinal development, we must beware of cutting down to the roots the great tree that, in the course of centuries, has overspread the whole earth. If the Holy Spirit abides in the Church, her whole life must expand under His guidance.

26. So vital an element is consistent development in every religious principle, that its presence may be detected even in religions invented by man. "If we turn our attention to the Chinese, Parsees, or Mohammedans, we shall stand astonished at the consistency with which they have drawn conclusions and built up details from first principles. Anyone who studies Greek heathenism critically, cannot fail to see how perfectly all successive religious developments harmonized with its fundamental principles. And is not the same thing perceptible in Luther's work? . . . The symbolical developments of doctrine in his Church are, on the whole, so clearly the outcome of his spirit, that their genuine Lutheran character is unmistakable."[29] Do not our Lord's words hold good here: "By their fruits you shall know them?" Should not he who enunciated adoration in spirit and truth as the principle of Christian worship, have looked to the fact that his work would endure? Granting that faith has never quite succeeded in destroying superstition root and branch, or in choking all the weeds that crop up in the matter of worship, such shortcomings are no argument against it. If the Spirit of God was promised to the Church to safeguard the faith, he will also make His presence felt in ecclesiastical worship.

27. Thus the Catholic Church has ever held to the golden mean between a fossil conservatism and infinite material perfectibility. Both the Greek and Protestant Churches are rigidly conservative; the former admitting development for

29 Möhler, *Symbolik*, p. 359.

only a very limited period, the latter considering that the "true development of Christianity lies in a return to the "pure form of primitive Biblical Christianity."[30] The other extreme, infinite material perfectibility, is the watchword of rationalists of all shades and hues. But the Catholic Church, while recognizing the absolute character of the revelation given by Christ, is also conscious that there is a living Spirit dwelling within her till the end of time. Not that she is inspired, as Protestants[31] interpret the doctrine that she is assisted by the Holy Ghost, but the religion founded by God the Son cannot rest on a dead letter. It must be a living force. It must have an unchangeable basis, and still be capable of being expanded by the Holy Spirit, even as God the Son unites in one person the eternal nature of God with the temporal nature of man, which latter admits of development. Protestant writers, like Hase, imagine that the Catholic Church is bound to pass off her new doctrines as old. *Thus*, they think, *she hopes to cloak the mistrust with which her own members regard the presence of the creative power of the Spirit within her.* It is clear that these writers neither understand the nature of development, nor the presence of the vivifying Spirit. For the living spirit, at work within her, makes the very letter of Holy Scripture quiver with life.

Though deeply convinced that the Christian religion was capable of development, the Catholic Church has never supposed that this development depended on an everflowing stream of revelations, as the following words from Irenæus abundantly prove. After brushing aside the errors of the Gnostics on creation and redemption, he proceeds thus: "The "preaching of the Church is everywhere consistent, and "continues in an even course, and receives testimony from "the prophets, the apostles and all the disciples—as I have

30 Strauss i. 259.

31 Hase, *Handbuch der Protest. Polemik*, 4th edit. 1878, p. 70. Tschakert, *Evangelische Polemik*, Gotha, 1885, p. 50. Scheele, *Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaft von Zoeckler*, Nördlingen, 1884, ii. 399.

"proved—through [those in] the beginning, the middle, and "the end, and through the entire dispensation of God, and "that well-grounded system which tends to man's salvation, "namely, our faith: which, having been received from the "Church, we do preserve, and which always, by the Spirit "of God, renewing its youth, as if it were some precious "deposit in an excellent vessel, causes the vessel itself "containing it to renew its youth also. For this gift of God "has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first "created man, for this purpose that all the members receiving "it may be vivified . . . For in the Church, it is said, "'God hath set apostles, prophets, teachers,' and all the "other means through which the Spirit works; of which "all those are not partakers, who do not join themselves to "the Church, but defraud themselves of life through their "perverse opinions and infamous behaviour." Later theologians, like S. Thomas and the Scholastics, Turrecremata and others, adopted, as we have said, the same standpoint.[32] *

32 Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreses* iii. 24. 1: (Clark's Translation). S. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* ii. ii. 1. 9. Turrecr. (Torguemada) *Summa de Ecclesia* i. 78.

* This is a point of capital importance, on which we wish to lay particular stress, as there are many, non-Catholics especially, who fail to grasp the distinction clearly and precisely. The Church, in her office of teacher, is *assisted* by the Holy Ghost, who explains and develops truths that have been revealed once for all, and that are contained somehow in the Apostolic deposit. So, in drawing inferences and conclusions from the data furnished by the deposit, the Church cannot make a mistake. But He does not, as it were, simply whisper these inferences into her ear, and relieve her of the trouble of conducting her researches and investigations in a human way. And hence the Church is not an organ for receiving new revelations, but for preserving in its fulness and entirety the revelation already given In this respect she stands in a totally different position from the old prophets and also from the Apostles. Their function was twofold: To supplement existing revelations with new matter, and to explain and preserve, independently of their own researches, the revelation that already existed. Hence they are called organs of revelation. The Church, then, merely requires the assistance of the Holy Spirit. But this is absolutely necessary. For if, in pursuance of her duty and office, she is to lay down the law of belief for the faithful, she must be able to give an absolute guarantee that her teaching is undoubtedly and unmistakably God's revealed word. Belief, as we understand it, demands absolute certainty that the object proposed to our belief is the very word of God Himself. But the Church cannot guarantee such absolute certainty, except in virtue of the divine assistance vouchsafed to her when she teaches with authority. Now under the name development the author comprises the chief functions of the *Ecclesia docens*. And hence Christian development postulates the presence of the Holy Ghost, and vice-versa the presence of the Holy Ghost necessarily entails development. See Chapter viii. Tr.

28. From the Protestant theory, which denied that the Holy Ghost was abiding in the Church and guiding her, and which held that Revelation—the water of life—was sealed up in the vessels of Scripture, two inconveniences inevitably resulted. In the hypothesis that the Church had departed from the letter of Scripture, a return to primitive Christianity became impossible; for, as Hase says, no living body ever reverts to a previous state.[33] Again, despite all checks imposed by symbols and confessions, the need for living development will make itself felt with such irresistible force that, as Strauss observes, another source will have to be substituted for the Spirit of God, to wit, the spirit of man.[34] And so it came to pass that, when the living spirit was banished from the Church, the chain of historical continuity was snapped. The truths that had hitherto developed in a direct line from Christ, and had grown naturally out of the primitive stock of revelation, that had moulded human ideas and institutions, and subjected the whole cycle of human life to the Spirit of Christ, were henceforth thrown a prey to human fancy and caprice.

Of course there was no intention of departing from the spirit of the sacred writers; but the human spirit unconsciously ousted the Spirit of Holy Scripture, and usurped His place. And soon it roamed at large, over the New Testament as well as the Old, and appointed reason supreme arbiter of Holy Scripture and Christianity. Reason had burst its bonds and could no longer be held in restraint, for the power inherent in the principle asserted itself. Writers of the vulgar Rationalistic School, by means of grammatical and historical glosses, explained away the supernatural element in revelation, put Holy Scripture on the same level as profane writings, and set up a shallow religion of natural reason and a weak-kneed morality. Speculative rationalists, on the other hand, considered religion a necessary form of knowledge for the uneducated, that

33 Hase, p. 68.
34 Strauss, l.c.

would disappear with progress, when the mind should rise to the knowledge of the absolute. Truth and perfection are not to be found at the beginning, but at the end.[35] Thus this school, while pretending to hold Christ in high esteem, degraded Christianity to the level of other religions and made it a mere link in the history of religion.

29. To avoid this conclusion, a distinction has been drawn between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas. But this distinction, besides resting on a purely external aspect of the doctrinal edifice, cuts the ground from under Holy Scripture. How is it possible to hold fast to the Trinity and Christ's divinity, the work of redemption and belief in eternal life, and yet to hand over to individual fancy all the other doctrines that Scripture and the Church teach with equal certitude? For once the principle of infallible revelation is broken through, no limit can be set to the principle of free rational enquiry. Where authority fails, subjectivity steps in. Unity becomes impossible, save the unity of opposition to Church authority. "The business of Protestantism," says a modern theologian,[36] "is to fight Rome, and at the same time to further the interests of pure Christianity. But Protestants hold widely divergent views as to what constitutes the inalienable truths of Christianity." Substantially, they say, it is the grace of Christ that brings pardon to the repentant sinner for his past transgressions, that gives him strength to do good, that enables him who, amid life's turmoil and trouble, turns with his whole heart and with confidence to the God revealed by Jesus, to attain inward peace and joy, and to succeed in doing good. "It should not be forgotten, by those schools of thought, whose direct aim it is to safeguard the faith once delivered, that the worth of the highest goods cannot be proved, but only felt. And those, who make it their business to effect a reconciliation between the Church's

35 See Kuhn, *Einleitung* p. 131 seq.

36 Holtzmann, *Theol. Literatur Zeitung*, 1885, No. 9. See Hase viii. and Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat*. München 1861, p. 412, 485, seq.

teaching and modern philosophy, should beware lest, through their negligence, religious life should suffer shipwreck."*

How ill Christianity would fare, were there no mean between these two extremes! Has Christ wholly abandoned the saving gifts of the gospel to the inner experience of the faithful and the unsteady verdict of human reason? No, the common deposit of the Apostles and the living word of Christ cannot have been committed to a ship without rudder or compass. The Spirit of Christ must steer Christ's work. The Church of Christ must be an inexhaustible fountain ever giving living water to the thirsty; a vine ever producing wine to gladden the heart of man. And as good ground blights not the husbandman's hopes, but yields corn for daily bread, so the Church of Christ must be a fertile soil producing fruits of grace. And our heavenly Father who prunes the vine, and plants the vineyard, and fences it round, and makes the soil fertile, will take care that in the Church of His Son, new life and vigour are ever streaming forth from a supernatural source. It will be His work to see that redemption, without let or hindrance, brings to all men, at all times, youth and strength. This His solicitude we see realized in the Church, the guardian of absolute revelation, which, by dispensing the grace of the Holy Spirit, establishes the Kingdom of God on earth.

30. The Vatican Council concludes its exposition of the relations between faith and reason with the words: "For the "doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been pro-"posed, like a philosophical invention, to be perfected by "human ingenuity, but has been delivered as a divine deposit "to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly "declared. Hence also that meaning of the sacred dogmas is "perpetually to be retained which our Holy Mother the Church

* The English reader will not be unfamiliar with this kind of cant. It is widespread in our time and country. In plain words, it means that the religious life of man is quite independent of religious truth. Yet strange to say, this unnatural and absurd dualism between mind and heart is seriously asserted, at times, by men of no mean intellectual power. Tr.

"has once declared, nor is that meaning ever to be departed "from, under the pretence or pretext of a deeper comprehension "of men. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of "each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all "ages and all times, increase and flourish in abundance and "vigour; but simply in its own proper kind, that is to say, in "one and the same doctrine, one and the same sense, one and "same judgment (Vincent of Lerins *Common.* n. 28)."[37]

37 *Constit. dogm. de fide Cath.* c. 4. Cardinal Manning's translation in *Petri Privilegium* p. 200.

CHAPTER II.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1. It was incumbent on Christ, the Messias promised by the prophets, to strike a new covenant with His people and the nations, and to establish a new kingdom in place of the old theocracy. In describing Christ's triple office of king, priest and prophet, the prophets have, at the same time, sketched His kingdom, in its outlines and constitution, in its development, aims and fortunes, with such clearness, that a complete picture of the structure actually erected by Christ may be easily gleaned from their descriptions. S. Augustine, when defending the Catholic Church against the sects, expresses the opinion that the prophets have spoken in even clearer terms of the Church than of Christ. For, as a rule, he says, they seem to shroud Christ in a veil of mystery, but preach the Church quite plainly.[1] In saying this S. Augustine had chiefly in view that mark of the Church which is most easily recognized, namely, its universality or catholicity; but elsewhere he dwells also on other marks as foretold by the prophets of old.

That the prophets generally expected a Kingdom of God to spring up in Messianic times is as clear as noonday. The older prophets, do not, indeed, employ the phrase, "Kingdom of God," but they frequently depict the glory of the Messianic age: justice, holiness, peace and grace are to be poured

[1] *Enarr. in Ps.* 30. Ser. ii. n. 8. See Catech. Council of Trent, I. 10. 2. Selbst, *Die Kirche Jesu Christi &c.*, Mainz, 1883.

abroad on all peoples ; the sun of truth is to shine on the heathen, and men are to be united with God in Immanuel. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him "that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace ; "of him that sheweth forth good, that preacheth salvation, "that saith to Sion : Thy God shall reign." (Isaias LII. 7). We can almost fancy these words to have been uttered by the Apostle of the Gentiles, who, writing to the Romans, says : "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink : "but justice and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. XIV. 17). Oftener, however, they borrow the colouring of their prophecies from the typical kingdom of David and Solomon. "A king shall reign, and shall be wise ; and "shall execute judgment and justice on the earth . . . and "this is the name that they shall call him : The Lord, our "just one." (Jerem. XXIII. 5, 6).

The higher character of this kingdom is already seen in such passages as the preceding, but in others it stands out with still greater clearness. In these latter, too, Jerusalem and Sion figure as the centre of God's old kingdom ; but these outward phrases have become, almost imperceptibly, luminous with spiritual meaning, betokening a Messianic kingdom in which, besides a remnant from Judaism, men from all nations shall call upon God's name, and find peace and happiness in God. Here, again, the phraseology and imagery, in which the Messianic blessings are depicted, are, as it were, echoes from that Paradise in which man and beast dwelt in untroubled and unclouded harmony with nature and with one another. But this only shows that a Messianic kingdom was to come, which would restore the kingdom that God had set up in the beginning.

The vivid and concrete style of the prophets made it necessary for them to lay the scene of the kingdom of God in the land of Palestine. The promised land, Israel's inheritance, was to the Israelite a symbol and at the same time a pattern

of his home in heaven, of his eternal inheritance. An Israelite's highest happiness was to dwell in peace and contentment in the promised land, flowing with milk and honey. How then, could the prophets have painted the future Messianic kingdom in brighter colours.? Just here and there they hint that the kingdom of God is not of this world, but only the later prophets put this thought prominently forward.[2] Sophonias, (about 620) however, seems to be an exception. In him this feature is represented as essential to the new kingdom. Of Israel's glorious victories over their enemies he either makes no mention or ascribes them to God. He makes no allusion to the Messias' royal character. In his eyes the new Israel is poor and needy, without riches, external splendour, or prestige. Its power is spiritual and ideal in its nature. The chastisements impending over Juda are for its inward purification. And thus people from the ends of the earth shall be brought to the knowledge of God. In the Jerusalem of untroubled peace none but the humble and simple shall dwell. Jeremias, too, saw in vision the fall of Jerusalem and the misfortunes of its people. Faithless Juda is rejected, and its sanctuary destroyed. And God will set other shepherds over His people, after His own heart, and will reveal Himself anew in Jerusalem.

2. Heretofore, then, we have not met the name "kingdom of God" or "kingdom of Heaven," which Daniel was the first to use. One after another he saw powerful kingdoms crumble to pieces, after doing their part towards preparing the way for the new kingdom. Daniel is in an especial and peculiar manner the prophet who beheld in the kingdom of God a spiritual, world-subduing force. After explaining what were the four kingdoms that Nabuchodonosor had seen in vision, he thus proceeds: "In the days of those kingdoms, the God of "heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, "and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people: "and it shall break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms

2 Zachar. ix. 9. See Isaias liii.

"and itself shall stand for ever." (Daniel II. 44). "The "saints of the most high God shall take the kingdom: and "they shall possess the kingdom for ever and ever." (VII. 18). "And the kingdom, and power, and the greatness of the "kingdom, under the whole heaven, may be given to the "people of the saints of the Most High: whose kingdom is "an everlasting kingdom, and all kings shall serve Him and "shall obey Him." (VII. 27). The foundation of this new and eternal kingdom was laid by the Son of Man, whom Daniel beheld in the vision of the night coming with the clouds of heaven. "And he came even to the ancient of days: and "they presented him before Him. And He gave him power, "and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes, and "tongues shall serve him. His power is an everlasting power "that shall not be taken away: and his kingdom, that shall not "be destroyed." (VII. 13, 14). In these words Daniel has given expression to two characteristics of this kingdom: it will be set up not by an earthly potentate, but by a Son of Man sent by God, and as a divine kingdom it will extend to all peoples and times.

3. How deeply the idea of a new kingdom had sunk into the minds of the Jews we know from the Gospels. The Son of Man is "the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God "shall give unto him the throne of David, His father; and He "shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of His "kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke I. 32, 33). "He "shall save his people from their sins." (Matth. I. 21). The Magnificat and Benedictus give an instructive insight into the hopes and aspirations of pious Israelites. The Jews generally were looking forward to the Messianic kingdom.[3] That the kingdom should come was their staple prayer. Was it not then in accordance with the whole spirit of prophecy, that John the Baptist proclaimed the kingdom of God to be at hand, and that our Lord began His public ministry with the

3 Luke ii. 25; xvii. 20; xxii. 18; xxiii. 51. Mark xv. 43. II Tim. iv. 8.

same watchword? The very fact that the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is peculiar to S. Matthew's Gospel, and is almost uniformly used except where a special and more personal signification is intended,[4] indicates its connection with ancient prophecy. John III. 5, however, would seem to be an exception. The Sinaitic codex, along with different Fathers, reads "kingdom of heaven," instead of "kingdom of God." But this reading has been rightly abandoned as a mere correction from S. Matthew. The expression "kingdom of heaven" occurs, indeed, pretty frequently in the language of the Jewish schools, but it corresponds neither in usage nor in meaning to S. Matthew's. For there is no proof that their phrase "kingdom of heaven" *(malkuth haschamajim)* was in use anterior to Christ. In the later rabbinical usage, which is maintained in the Talmud and Jewish liturgy up to the present day, the expression refers to the Jewish theocracy, not to the Messianic kingdom. The only passage in the Targum that will bear the meaning is that on Michæas IV. 7: "And the kingdom of "heaven shall be revealed on Mount Sion, now and for ever." But even here it is only equivalent to the rabbinical phrase, "kingdom of God."[5] Possibly the rabbis were induced to put the word heaven in place of the sacred name Jahve, which they shrunk from uttering.

The reason why one and the same expression is used in a different sense by S. Matthew and S. John on the one side, and by the Talmudists and Targumists on the other, is not far to seek. Both parties took their stand on the common ground of ancient prophecy. On this they ever kept their eyes steadily fixed. Now Jesus Christ had fulfilled the prophecy in a spiritual sense; whence the rabbis, breathing hostility to Christianity, were naturally driven to contend that the expression had reference to the Jewish theocracy and not to the Messianic kingdom. From the moment, however, that Jesus styled Himself the Son of Man, all doubt as to the identity of

4 xii. 28; xix. 24; xxi. 31, 43 See. vi. 10.
5 Targ. ad Is. 40, 9; 53, 10.

the kingdom of heaven with Daniel's kingdom was removed. It was clear that Jesus the Son of Man came down from heaven, established the everlasting kingdom foretold by Daniel, and showered down heaven's blessings on mankind. That there is a twofold kingdom of heaven, one in the next world and one on earth, is sufficiently indicated by S. Matthew as often as the Heavenly Father, the Father in heaven, is mentioned.[6] The latter phrase occurs nowhere else, except in Mark XI. 25, where it is naturally in place, and is parallel to Matth. VI. 14.

4. Was not S. Matthew, it may be asked, induced by his antagonism to the Roman Empire to lay greater stress on the distinction between the two kingdoms? In the then existing anti-Roman feeling this would be intelligible; but then S. Matthew is hardly more decisive in his opposition to the Roman Empire than to the Jewish nation. That opposition, again, was not less pronounced in the rabbis, and yet it had no such effect upon them. They never relaxed in their pretensions, or modified their political views and ideals. Instead of hastening the coming of the kingdom promised by the prophets, by bearing wrongs patiently and with resignation to God's will, they wished to establish it by force; and they pictured the Messianic era as a day of wrath, in which they were to be the instruments of God's vengeance on the heathen. Even John the Baptist had not at first fully outgrown this peculiar Jewish conception. He, too, conceived the beginnings of the Messianic kingdom differently from what they were. His thoughts centred on the Messianic judgment, when one mightier than himself, with the power of a Messias-King, would thoroughly cleanse his floor, and separate the wheat from the chaff. (III. 12).*

It is open to question whether the Jews drew a distinction

6 M. vi. 9; vii. 11, 21; x. 32; xii. 50; xvi. 17; xviii. 10, 19. See Schanz, *Comment. in Marc.* p. 346.

* This inference would not seem to be altogether necessary. From the fact that he delivered his message in the language of the prophets, it does not necessarily follow that his own spiritual and supernatural knowledge did not reach beyond it. Tr.

between the kingdom of heaven in this world and that in the next. When, therefore, S. Matthew draws the distinction, he is acting independently of political motives. In the majority of passages in his gospel, the kingdom of heaven is represented as a kingdom that came down from heaven to earth. Other passages that speak of it as a kingdom on earth, do not deny its heavenly origin. For not only is the Father in heaven, who rules all, and to whom all things tend, its author and centre, but its gifts and good things are gifts from the Father of lights. And if Jahve, who pitched His tents among His people, was the King of Israel under the old covenant, so God's nearness in the New Testament through the Incarnation is a link joining earth and heaven far more closely, and transforming God's kingdom on earth into a kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven mentioned in the gospel was founded when God became man and poured forth a heavenly life of grace and sanctity on earth, in order to convert this vale of tears into a Paradise, and to win back the kingdom of the prince of this world to its Lord and Maker. The kingdom will be completed, when Christ shall come again in glory and majesty (Parousia), to judge the living and the dead. It is, indeed, a spiritual kingdom; but this by no means implies either that salvation is accomplished exclusively in heaven, or that this spiritual conception of it is the growth of a later (apocalyptic) age, after Israel had abandoned all hope of seeing an earthly fulfilment of the Theocracy. If, as some critics contend, the gospel of S. Matthew consists of two distinct parts, the *Logia* and the narratives, the phrase "kingdom of heaven" at all events must be assigned to the more ancient. It is the dominant note of the whole gospel, that was re-echoed in after ages. Justin, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Ephrem use the expression, no doubt under the influence of the gospel of S. Matthew, which, whatever its purpose, whether anti-Jewish or not, is at any rate most prophetical in character.

5. The later evangelists, though, in all probability, they

were acquainted with the first gospel, eschewed the phrase. And, indeed, to the Gentile Christian reader it was less intelligible and more easily misunderstood than the parallel phrase "kingdom of God." This latter is more easily grasped, whether by it we understand the community of those who pray that God's kingdom may come, and that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven, or whether we think of it as a kingdom that has its seat in God. For our present purpose the distinction is of no consequence, except in so far as it marks a step in advance, and denotes a further development of the ideas underlying the term. Anyhow the disappearance of the term was not due to a desire, on the part of the evangelists, to efface all memory of the Messianic kingdom which the Son of David had founded. For the very fact that they introduce Christ's forerunner shows that they had in mind and wished to recall the long stages of preparation through which the Old Testament had passed. Hence we are not surprised to find that Mark has recorded that the phrase "kingdom of David" was contained in the joyful shout raised by the multitude on the occasion of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem (XI. 10). This is the only instance in which it occurs in the New Testament. It is a phrase similar to "Son of David" which is frequently found in S. Matthew.

6. For a more detailed description of the kingdom of heaven in the New Testament, we naturally turn to the first Gospel. That the Messias is to be its king we gather from the Baptist. And when he baptizes unto the remission of sins, and requires the people to bring forth fruits of penance by confessing their sins, he plainly teaches that man's inward conversion and regeneration is the goal at which the new kingdom aims. Jesus also demands repentance, as a necessary preparation for the new kingdom. We read that He went about all Galilee preaching the Gospel of the kingdom. (Matth. IV. 23). What this really meant is shown from the Sermon on the Mount, wherein, so to speak, Christ unfolded His

programme. The beatitudes are not, indeed, concerned with this life alone; but how could they have formed such a magnificent introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, if they had been merely a picture of the kingdom of the blessed? How could they have formed the basis of our Lord's demand for the fulfilment of the law? Though we may not attach any special force to the argument that they are spoken throughout in the present tense, seeing that they are general sentences,—still their very aim and purpose is to point to a kingdom that our Saviour was to found in opposition to the worldly and external ideas of the Jews. By promising the kingdom of heaven both at the beginning and the end, He sufficiently indicates that all other blessings have reference primarily to it; in a word, that they are spiritual blessings.

7. Accordingly we find that the qualifications for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven are spiritual, and that spiritual blessings are the rewards it holds out. These blessings, in their totality, constitute the kingdom of God. The poor in spirit and the persecuted possess the kingdom. Could the contrast to this world's goods be more sharply defined? Comfort to the sorrowful, possession of the land to the weak, feeding the hungry, and giving drink to the thirsty, mercy obtained by shewing mercy, the sight of God to the clean of heart, the gift of sonship to the peacemakers;—all this points to a spiritual citizenship which bases happiness on contentment, mutual charity and resignation to God. Of a truth man's infirmity cannot fully rise to this ideal, and therefore he directs his gaze to a better future for its attainment. The Church does the same, by applying the eight beatitudes to the feast of All Saints, in order to honour the blessed in heaven, and to encourage those who are still struggling on earth. But this very fact, while shewing that we are to look for the eternal and imperishable reward only in heaven, also implies that the kingdom of heaven on earth is the battlefield on which we are to win an immortal crown.

Christ Himself declares that the old kingdom was broken up and the new begun with the advent of the Baptist. "From the "days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven "suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away." (Matth. XI. 12.) When Jesus had pointed out to a Scribe the first and greatest commandment of love, He received for answer: "Well, "master, thou hast said in truth, that there is one God, and "there is no other besides Him. And that He should be loved "with the whole heart, and with the whole understanding, and "with the whole soul, and with the whole strength; and to "love one's neighbour as himself, is a greater thing than all "holocausts and sacrifices. And Jesus seeing that he had "answered wisely, said to him: Thou art not far from the "kingdom of God." (Mark XII. 32 seq.) When Jesus sent forth the seventy-two disciples, He said to them: "Heal "the sick that are therein, and say to them: The kingdom of "God is come nigh unto you." (Luke X. 9 11.) In reply to the Pharisees who ascribed his power to cast out devils to a compact with Beelzebub, Jesus said: "But if I by the Spirit of "God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon "you." (Matth. XII. 28). "And when He was asked by the "Pharisees: When the kingdom of God should come? He, "answering them said: The kingdom of God cometh not with "observation. Neither shall they say: Behold here, or behold "there; for, lo, the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke XVII. 20 21). Joseph of Arimathæa, a senator, a good and just man, who had not consented to their counsel and doings, "himself waited for the kingdom of God." (Luke XXIII. 50-1).

8. Jesus assigns duties to the citizens of the kingdom of heaven in the present life. They must be faithful stewards and humble believers. "Therefore is the kingdom of heaven "likened to a king who would take an account of his servants." (Matth. XVIII. 23); "to a master of a family, who went out early "in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard." (XX. 1); to a "king who made a marriage for his son" (XX. 2); "to ten

"virgins, who taking their lamps, went out to meet the bride-"groom and the bride." (xxv. 1). He requires His disciples, if they would enter into the kingdom of heaven, to become as little children. "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as "this little child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." (xviii. 1 seq.). "Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God "and His justice; and all these things shall be added unto you." (vi. 33). As Jesus began the Sermon on the Mount with the beatitudes, so He finished by promising a kingdom in the life beyond: "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall "enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will "of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom "of heaven." (vii. 21). Many Fathers refer the petition in the Our Father to the future kingdom: Jesus bids the high priests and scribes to look to His second coming (see also Matth. xxvi. 29). Then shall His disciples see the kingdom of God, and the peoples shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[7] Only when this goal is reached, will the kingdom of heaven on earth cease. The work of redemption finishes with the next age of the world, and all things shall again be subjected to the Father.

9. "Afterwards," writes S. Paul, "the end, when He shall "have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when "He shall have abolished all principality, and authority, and "power. For He must reign, until He hath put all His enemies "under His feet. And the enemy, Death, shall be destroyed "last." (I Cor. 24-26). In these words the Apostle points out the *negative* duty that devolves on the kingdom of God, namely, the destruction of the kingdom of Satan, sin and death. Its *positive* function consists in healing the wounds made by sin, and in promoting man's spiritual and temporal well-being. Now both these functions have to be exercised in and upon human society, and must, therefore, consist in

Luke ix. 27; xiii. 28; xiv. 15; xxii. 18; Matth. viii. 11; xviii. 3. 25; xix. 23; Mark ix. 47. John iii. 5.

external as well as internal action; in a word, the kingdom of God must be visible. Men must know where it is and which it is. This double aspect of the kingdom of God is well brought out by the words and example of our Lord Himself. As a clear proof to men that the kingdom of God had come, He appeals to His power of working miracles and casting out devils. (Luke XI. 14-20). His authority and office and work were thus plain and unmistakable. On the other hand, He says that His kingdom is not of this world (Luke XVIII. 36), that is, He spurns the means which the mighty ones of the earth employ to establish and extend their power. His kingdom comes not with observation, that is, with external pomp and splendour; its voice is not heard in the street. (Matth. XII. 18. 19). In other words the kingdom of God will be like Christ Himself; its strength divine and invisible, its main purpose and means spiritual, but itself, like the God-Man, must take its place and position amidst a world of sense. Hence He gave to His disciples, besides the grace of internal conversion, power to heal and to cast out devils, as He Himself had done; reminding them, however, that this was but a means, not the end of the kingdom of heaven. "And the seventy-two returned with joy, saying: Lord, the "devils also are subject to us in thy name. And he said to "them: I saw Satan as lightning falling from heaven . . . "But yet rejoice not in this that spirits are subject unto "you: but rejoice in this that your names are written in "heaven." (Luke X. 17-20).

10. The name Jesus brought terror to the devils, but happiness and salvation to the disciples. The confession of this name became the password and external mark of recognition of the citizens of the kingdom of God. Had not our Lord declared those blessed who were reviled and hated and persecuted for His name's sake? "For so they persecuted "the prophets that were before you." (Matth. v. 12). Has He not promised: "Whosoever shall confess me before men,

"I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven; "but whosoever shall deny me before men, I will also deny "him before my Father who is in heaven"? (Matth. x. 32-33). This confession, however, is not a mere lip-service—a saying, Lord, Lord; but as the citizens of a worldly kingdom must execute the behests of an earthly monarch, so Christ's disciples must do the will of the Father who is in heaven. God's kingdom has also its laws and ordinances which derive their importance from the sovereign authority that gave them.

As the soldier in the army swears fealty to his sovereign, and wears the badge of his commander, so the soldier of Christ must wear the sign of Christ upon himself, and be loyal and true to Him as his King and sovereign Lord. Both conditions are necessary. To become a member of the kingdom of God an external and an internal qualification are required. This is implied in the words of our Lord to Nicodemus (John III. 3, 5): "Amen, amen, I say to thee, except a man be born again, "he cannot see the kingdom of God. . . . unless a man "be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter "into the kingdom of God." Whether we here refer the word "kingdom of God" chiefly to the kingdom on earth, or to that beyond this life, this much is clear: that baptism is put forth not merely as an external condition or empty sign, but as an internal, regular, and essential institution of that kingdom, whereby the inward man is renewed. The same appears, more clearly still, from the charge of our Lord to the Apostles: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations: baptizing them . . . "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-"manded you." (Matth. XXVIII. 18-20). Baptism, as involving the observance of God's commandments, is the badge of membership of the kingdom of heaven.

In the Old Law circumcision, which Jahve enjoined on Abraham as a sign of the Covenant, was a type of Baptism. The uncircumcised were exterminated. In the New Law circumcision of heart has, indeed, supplanted circumcision of

the flesh, and yet, since man is a compound of matter and spirit, spiritual regeneration must be linked to a visible sign. The God-man, who conversed with men in a visible form, required an outward token of union with the spiritual kingdom of God. This significance of baptism, as indicating membership of God's kingdom, is clearly seen from S. John's preparatory baptism, which for saintly Israelites was "in very deed a circumcision of the heart of the nation." Josephus relates that John bade the Jews to practise virtue, to comport themselves with justice towards one another, and with piety towards God, and to use baptism as a means of union for the purpose of the new Covenant.[8] Of course the baptism of Jesus is not a mere means of outward union, nor a mere symbol of inward renewal, as were circumcision and John's baptism. These could not effect the remission of sins, that they symbolized and foreshadowed. That was to be the work of Christian baptism. Still Christian baptism itself is also a symbol, a sign of the Triune God, who has marked off the citizens of the kingdom of God from the children of this world. Baptism, moreover, being destined for all peoples and nations, is a more universal sign than circumcision.

11. There is yet another sign of membership to be mentioned. Jesus, marvelling over the centurion's faith, uttered these memorable words: "Many shall come from the east and "the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob "in the kingdom of heaven." We have already interpreted this phrase, in the preceding pages, of the future kingdom. But the very fact that these words were levelled at the Jews, justifies us in explaining this fellowship in the kingdom of heaven with the just of the Old Law, as typical of those who are truly God's table-companions in the Messianic kingdom on earth. The partaking in a common table is yet another visible sign that they belong to the kingdom, and participate in its goods and blessings. Verily Jesus has promised to give His

8 *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2.

disciples His flesh to eat and His blood to drink, that they may have eternal life. (John VI. 56 seq.). And on the night before His passion He promulgated to His disciples the New Covenant. He assured them that by eating this bread and drinking this chalice they would live in Him, and through Him in the Father; and by bidding them to do this in memory of Him, He instituted a love-feast by which all the faithful were to be united in the closest bonds with one another, and with their Redeemer. The purifying waters of baptism and the bread of life are the two great signs set up by Christ Himself, to show that the kingdom of God first established in Paradise is again restored.

12. But Jesus clearly forsaw the dangers looming in the future, and threatening the kingdom of God that He had restored. He knew that the wily serpent that first caused dissension and created a breach between God and man, would not lose all its venomous power, even after He had crushed its head. He could not therefore take better precautions to guard the new community from hurt, than by unfolding its future fortunes, and laying bare the wicked artifices of its foe. God's kingdom, though not of the world, is in the world, and is not unswayed by its strifes and struggles. And therefore Jesus revealed the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven to the disciples, but to the multitude He spoke in parables.

The sower went forth to sow the seed of the word. Some seed fell by the wayside, and some sprang up indeed, but never reached maturity. The word never profits even the greater number of those who receive it unto salvation. In time of affliction and persecution many fall away, while the cares and riches and pleasures of this life choke the word in others. This distinction between the good and bad members of God's kingdom is still more marked in the parable of the cockle among the wheat. "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man that "sowed good seed in his field. But while the men were asleep, "his enemy came and oversowed cockle among the wheat."

(Matth. XIII. 24. 25). And the master would not allow his servants to gather up the cockle, lest perhaps they should root up the wheat together with it, but he bade them suffer it to grow till the harvest-time. Again, "the kingdom of heaven is "like to a net cast into the sea, and gathering together all kinds "of fishes." (Matth. XIII. 47). The net of this kingdom holds fishes, both good and bad, but when it is drawn ashore the bad are thrown away. "So shall it be at the end of the world. "The angels shall go forth, and shall separate the wicked from "among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire." (49. 50). But till then the wicked in the kingdom of heaven will be side by side with the just, the cockle will be suffered to grow up with the wheat, and the foolish virgins will sit with the wise.

After this explicit declaration, who will be scandalized because Christ's kingdom on earth is not composed exclusively of the just? Who, on that account, can refuse to acknowledge as the kingdom established by Christ the visible society which shows forbearance even to the erring in order to win them back again? Did not Jesus come to seek that which was lost? Did He not go in search of the lost sheep of the House of Israel? Did He not eat and drink with publicans and sinners? One of the twelve was the traitor; and yet Jesus, knowing this, suffered him to stay with Him. He wills not the death of a sinner, but rather that he be converted and live. To the barren fig-tree He allowed one, two, and three years grace to see whether or no it would bear fruit. (Luke XIII. 6).

13. The progress of Christ's kingdom is similar to its commencement. It has the power to draw men both inwardly and outwardly within the magnetic circle of its influence and action. To console His little flock, Christ often foretold in parables that it would grow both outwardly and inwardly. "The kingdom of heaven is like to leaven, which a woman "took and hid in three measures of meal, until the whole "was leavened." (Matth. XIII. 33). To this inward trans-

formation, effected by the leaven of Christian doctrine and grace, there is a corresponding outward expression. The mightier a force is, the more irresistible is the influence it exerts on all things with which it comes in contact. How beautifully this external growth is mirrored forth in the parable of the mustard seed! "The kingdom of heaven is "like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and "sowed in his field, which indeed is the least of all seeds. "But when it is grown up it is greater than all herbs, and "becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come, and "dwell in the branches thereof." (Matth. XIII. 31. 32). So unpretentious, so insignificant was the kingdom founded by Jesus that the Scribes, when it was already in their midst, still asked when it was coming! But it will grow great, and be visible from afar as a sign among the nations, so that men will come from the ends of the earth, seeking shelter under its branches. "And I, if I be lifted up from the "earth will draw all things to myself." (John XII. 32).

14. So mighty, indeed, is its force that men will give their most costly possessions in exchange for the kingdom of heaven. "The kingdom of heaven is like to a treasure hidden "in a field, which a man having found hideth, and for joy "thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that "field. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like to a merchant "seeking good pearls, who when he had found one pearl "of great price, went his way, and sold all that he had, "and bought it." (Matth. XIII. 44-46). Such is the kingdom of God, which men are bidden to seek in the first place; these are its treasures which neither rust nor moth can consume. How admirably this clear, simple, figurative language blends the inner and outer characteristics, the visible and the invisible properties of the kingdom of heaven! How full of vitality is the heavenly kingdom from its insignificant beginning among the disciples, to its establishment among all peoples! The interior and the outer rim do not, indeed,

always correspond; but this outcome of human frailty and sinfulness is tolerated, because man's wickedness will never be able to overthrow God's saving power The fruits which the good seed lavishly brings forth, and the influence of grace and salutary doctrine tend to hasten the steps of the lagging members, and to teach them to prize the costly pearl hidden in the field.

15. The Apostles, following their divine Master's instructions, zealously pushed forward the work that He had begun and endowed with vital force. They went forth and preached the kingdom of God. "But when they had believed Philip "preaching of the kingdom of God, in the name of Jesus "Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts VIII. 12). S. Paul preached the kingdom of God at Ephesus (XIX. 8), and took leave of the bishops at Ephesus in these words: "And now behold I know that all you, among whom "I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see "my face no more." (XX. 25). Even when imprisoned at Rome, he was "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching "the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all "confidence, without prohibition." (XXVIII. 31). Again, he confirmed the disciples, and exhorted them to continue in the faith, and taught them that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Acts XIV. 22).

In the Apostolic Epistles the phrase "kingdom of God" holds a less conspicuous place. And yet the several elements of the idea may be discerned. First and foremost they point to heaven as our inheritance in the next world, to our Lord's promise, to the reward that awaits those who fight the good fight on this earthly pilgrimage. S. Paul is overflowing with joy over the hope that is soon to be realized,—the near approach of the Parousia. All with one concerted voice proclaim that God's kingdom stands in sharp antagonism to this world's good and pleasures, and is mightier than its kingdoms. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink,

"but justice and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. XIV. 17). It is a kingdom of the Son of divine love, into which God has translated the faithful, by delivering them from the power of darkness. (Col. I. 13). In propagating this kingdom the Apostle and his disciples spent their whole lives. (IV. 13). "Therefore receiving an immovable kingdom, we "have grace; whereby let us serve, pleasing God, with fear "and reverence." (Heb. XII. 28). Fear, too, is necessary. For full and undisturbed possession begins in death, and only faithful stewards will have part in this eternal kingdom. "For know ye this and understand that no fornicator, nor "unclean, nor covetous person (which is a serving of idols) "hath inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." "Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom "of God? Do not err. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, "nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liers with mankind, "nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor "extortioners shall possess the kingdom of God."[9] "Hath "not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, and "heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them "that love Him?" (James II. 5). "Wherefore, brethren, "labour the more that by good works you may make sure "your calling and election . . . For so an entrance shall "be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom "of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (II Pet. I. 11). The Lord, says S. Paul, hath delivered me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom.[10]

16. The notion of the kingdom of God, therefore, as set forth in the New Testament, contains two elements: God's kingdom is a special gift and grace, or rather the sum total of supernatural gifts, enabling man to obtain eternal salvation; yet so that this gift finds its realization only in a visible

Ephes. v. 5. I Cor. vi. 9; xv. 50. Gal. v. 21. Rom. v. 17; viii. 17. II Tim. ii. 12.

10 II Tim. iv. 18. Phil i. 23. Hebr. xii. 22.

commonwealth. It may be true that "Jesus did not primarily "regard the kingdom of heaven as a commonwealth, but as "an organism of heaven-born forces, which are at work among "men to subject them to God's sovereign dominion;"[11] still it acts on mankind through the instrumentality of men, and in a certain sense finds its realization and outward expression in the members of a commonwealth. For not only does Jesus enumerate the conditions of admission into His kingdom, but, in contradistinction to strangers, that is the children of earthly kingdoms, He describes its members as sons of the Messias-King, who, because they are sons, are free from the payment of tribute. (Matth. XVII. 25). Granted that the kingdom of God is an idea, a means to an end to which all else must be subordinate, yet it cannot be denied that it is withal an idea that is already clothed with flesh and blood. As Christ is, so is His religion. It is the union of the divine and human. Therefore the kingdom of God, like Christianity, is something divine and human; it is the ideal and real, entwined in the visible society of believers. How could men be heirs to eternal life, unless things human could unite with and interact on things divine on earth; unless flesh and blood could be sanctified and spiritualized?

17. Were not the disciples of Jesus the germ of this visible society? In accordance with Jewish usage they are called disciples, and Jesus Himself is addressed as Rabbi, Rabboni, Lord, and Master. Jesus was not, indeed, the master of any particular school, as He had not been educated in any Rabbinical schools, but there was a close analogy between the relations of Jesus with His disciples, and the relations in which Jewish disciples, notably the disciples of the Baptist, stood to their masters. In this way the first group of our Lord's disciples grew up. Of them it is said that they believed

11 Cremer, *Wörterbuch zum N.T.* Schmidt, *Die Kirche* p. 11. Haupt, *Studien und Kritiken* 1887, p. 383. Köstlin, *ib.* 1888, p. 29. Edersheim, *The Life of Jesus*, London, 1884, v. 1. p. 270. (He collected the 119 passages on the point).

in Jesus. (John II. 11). Others, indeed, believed, but Jesus would not trust Himself to them. (John II. 24). When Jesus was baptizing in Judæa, "there arose a question between "some of John's disciples and the Jews concerning purification. "And they came to John and said to him: Rabbi, he that "was with thee beyond the Jordan, to whom thou gavest "testimony, behold he baptizeth, and all men come to him." (III. 25. 26). "He must increase but I must decrease" (III. 30), replied the Baptist. "He that believeth in the Son hath "life everlasting; but he that believeth not the Son shall "not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him." (III. 36). And many in Galilee, Capharnaum, and Samaria believed.

18. And now there had gathered round Jesus an inner and an outer circle of followers,—the disciples and the faithful. Christ, from whom grace and truth flow, was their visible head. And even among the disciples the twelve held a special rank. For after Jesus' discourse in the Synagogue at Capharnaum it is related that many of His disciples thought: This is a hard saying, and who can hear it? "And after this many of His "disciples went back, and walked no more with Him. Then "Jesus said to the twelve: will you also go away? And "Simon Peter answered Him: "Lord to whom shall we go? "Thou hast the words of eternal life . . . Jesus answered "them: Have I not chosen you twelve; and one of you is "a devil." (John VI. 67-69-71).

About the election of the Apostles John says nothing, as he supposes the account in the Synoptists to be known. These relate how Jesus called two sets of brothers to follow Him, in order to make them fishers of men (Matth. IV. 18 seq), and how He called Levi from the custom-house (IX. 9 seq). "And going up unto a mountain . . . He made that "twelve should be with Him, and that He might send them "to preach. And He gave them power to heal sickness and "to cast out devils." (Mark III. 12 seq). S. Matthew in relating the Sermon on the Mount, draws a distinction

between the "multitudes" and the "disciples" who "came "unto Him;" (v. 1); and in S. Luke, Christ's followers are grouped in three sections: the twelve, the disciples, and the people." (VI. 12 seq.) The number twelve recalls the twelve tribes of Israel. For the twelve were to be the twelve patriarchs of the new kingdom. To them are communicated the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and at Christ's second coming they are to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Matth. XIX. 28). At the close of a parable Jesus asked the twelve: "Have ye "understood all these things? They say to Him, yea. He "said unto them: Therefore every scribe instructed in the "kingdom of heaven is like to a man that is a householder, "who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and "old." (Matth. XIII. 52).

The understanding of the disciples had not yet fully grasped the idea of the new kingdom. Even on the last journey to Jerusalem the sons of Zebedee ask to have seats assigned to them on Christ's right and left in the new kingdom. Nay the disciples going to Emmaus say with drooping hearts: "We hoped that it was He that should have "redeemed Israel." (Luke XXIV. 21). Now Jesus combated, not the idea of God's kingdom on earth, but the worldly and carnal notions entertained by the disciples. He admonished them not to aspire to secular lordship, but to do His will, and to be zealous in the work which He had undertaken for the sanctification and salvation of mankind. "You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord "it over them, and they that are the greater exercise "greater power upon them. It shall not be so among "you; but whosoever will be the greater among you, let "him be your minister. And he that will be first among "you shall be your servant, even as the Son of Man "is not come to be ministered unto but to minister, "and to give His life a redemption for many." (Matth. "XX. 25).

19. The faithful together with the disciples form one society revolving round Christ as a centre. "Every kingdom,"

says our Lord, "divided against itself shall be made desolate, "and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. "And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; "how then shall his kingdom stand?" (Matth. XII. 25, 26). "But if I, by the Spirit of God, cast out devils then is the king-"dom of God come unto you." (v. 29). Shall this kingdom of God be more divided, less united than the kingdom of Satan? On the other hand, would the kingdom of Satan and of this world endure unless it presented, as it were, a serried phalanx against attack? "He that is not with me," said Jesus, "is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" (Matth. XII. 30; Luke XI. 23); and He had previously said: "He that is not against you is for you." (Luke IX. 50). The one is a consequence of the other. These words imply that the followers of Jesus form a society, towards which the world must assume some attitude. They are the answer to John's complaint against the man who cast out devils, and yet followed not Jesus. All, says Jesus graciously, who are not evilly disposed, and who confess the name of Jesus, must be regarded as friends and fellow-workers.

20. The unity of this society attains its zenith in S. John's Gospel. In the parable of the Good Shepherd, Jesus represents Himself as the Good Shepherd who enters by the door into the sheepfold. He knows His sheep, and they know His voice and follow Him. Jesus is also the door. By Him if any man enter in, he shall be saved. He will lead His sheep to good pastures and protect them against wolves. "And other sheep "I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and "they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one "Shepherd." (Luke X. 16). The imagery here employed denotes an inner as well as an outer companionship with Jesus. The Jewish believers, taken from the old Synagogue, are contrasted with the misguided herd led by the Pharisees who are stigmatised as thieves and robbers. And thus the believers form a new flock, a new kingdom, whose visible head is Christ.

But the believers, still to be recruited from the ranks of heathenism, will form one flock with the Jews and have one Shepherd. Christ will also be their Shepherd. But will it be in the same manner as He ruled the believers in Jerusalem? Or was the *one visible* flock to be sooner or later bereft of a visible leader and head?

Furthermore, in S. John's Gospel, Jesus has more closely determined the position the disciples were to hold in God's kingdom. He ate the love-feast with them, and set them a pattern of humility by washing their feet. He consoled them for His departure, warned them of the dangers that the world would strew in their path, and promised them assistance from the Father. He has depicted in glowing colours the cohesion of the disciples among themselves, and their union with Himself, and the Father. His unity with the Father is the model for their unity in charity. In the parable of the vine He represents as indispensable for membership of the kingdom of sanctity and virtue, an inward union through the grace which streams from the fountain-head. Unity in faith and charity is the cornerstone of our great high-priest's prayer. "Holy Father, "keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given me, that they "may be one, as we also are." "As Thou hast sent me into the "world; I also have sent them into the world. And for them "do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in "truth." (John XVII. 11, 18, 19). And then Jesus turns His gaze from the twelve to all who shall believe in Him, and He begs His Father to keep them also in unity, "that they may all "be one as thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee; that they "also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou "hast sent me." (XVII. 20, 21).

21. Thus, then, the Kingdom of Heaven is the sum of heavenly gifts which Christ has won for believers, and it is likewise the society of the Apostles and the faithful under the headship of Christ. By this society the gifts of grace are rendered operative and fruitful unto life eternal, that is, to the

Kingdom of Heaven in the next world. This society, which has been commissioned to work out the destinies of the Kingdom of Heaven, has been specially named by its founder, *the Church.* (Matth. xvi. 18).

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE.

1. The word "Church," like the phrase "kingdom of heaven," is peculiar to S. Matthew's Gospel, in which it occurs twice: Matth. XVI. 18 and XVIII. 17. Both passages contain instructions to the Twelve and are closely related. In the former our Lord says to Simon Peter: "Thou art Peter and "upon this rock I will build *my Church*, and the gates of "hell shall not prevail against it." In the latter He says to the Apostles: "If he will not hear them (two or more witnesses), "tell *the Church;* and if he will not hear the Church, let him "be to thee as the heathen and the publican." And if we seek the word in its source, we shall not go far astray if we turn to the Old Testament. That S. Matthew's Gospel is intimately connected with the Old Testament is undeniable. Quite independently of the question whether or no it was originally written in Hebrew, its contents and evident scope clearly establish this connection, which is quite sufficient to account for the fact that the word "Church" is used by S. Matthew, and by him alone. On the other hand, to contend that the word has been interpolated from the Acts or S. Paul's Epistles is a most arbitrary proceeding, that derives no support from textual criticism. The word is simply the Greek and and Latin equivalent for the Hebrew *Kahal* which means literally convocation,[1] and it usually denoted the "Jewish

1. Lev. iv. 13. Numbers xvi. 3; xx. 4. Deut. xviii. 16; xxiii. 1 seq; xxxi. 30: Josue viii. 35. Judges xxi 8 See Acts vii. 38. Exodus xix. 3. Hebr. ii. 12.

D

commune, assembly, congregation or meeting." In using the word, therefore, to denote the commune, assembly, meeting, (synagogue) of the new Covenant, the new Theocracy, S. Matthew is following the analogy of the Old Testament. And, indeed, this was very natural, and harmonized with his purpose. He is at great pains to show that the Jewish people as such had been rejected, both in its rulers and in the mass. With all the more reason, therefore, he was bound to set forth the foundation of a new theocracy, a new world-wide commonwealth, the Church of Christ.* Again, it was quite impossible for a convert from Judaism to imagine a religion without an external visible community, or without a compact and definite organization. And hence S. Matthew has likewise chosen

* It may be useful to bring out somewhat more fully and clearly this, in our judgment, extremely important point. In the Old Testament there are two words to express what we should call the (Mosaic) Church, namely *Kahal*— ἐκκλησία (from ἐκκαλέω to call out, convoke)—convocation; and *Edah*—συναγωγή (from συνάγειν, to bring together, to gather)—*conventus*, *congregatio*, assembly, and meeting. Now the two great features of the Mosaic Church were, firstly, that the people had been called in the most signal manner out of Egypt by God Himself, and secondly, that they were made into a nation, a people, a commonwealth, a civil and religious organic body, not by man, but by God. They were *the called* of God (*par excellence*), and God's own family or state (Theocracy). Hence the two words serve admirably to express one or the other of these two characteristic features. Moreover, the time when these two facts in their history would come home to them most vividly, would be when they were gathered together round the tabernacle (real presence of God) in solemn worship; and hence, the two words would especially apply to that assembly and meeting. From this we conclude that, by long usage, they had acquired a very *definite* meaning, and were calculated to raise a very definite picture in the mind of every Jew, who used them or heard them. If this be duly borne in mind, it will be easier to appreciate the vast significance of the words our Lord addressed to St. Peter in M. xvi. 18., and to realize the impresssion they must have produced in the minds of the twelve. To them it must have been one of the most momentous utterances conceivable, scarcely second to S. Peter's wonderful confession. That very moment, in which they heard and recognized that they stood in the presence of the Son of the living God, was chosen by Him to tell them: Upon this rock I shall build *my* Kahal. What else could they understand but that he who spoke was both Moses and Jehova in one, for no one else could speak thus, because their old Kahal was the Kahal of Moses indeed, but really of Jehova.

The reader will also notice that in the next verse S. Matthew continues: To thee I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The English word Church, like the German *Kirche*, Kirk, is derived from the Greek κυριακή—Dominica. (Tr.)

those parables concerning the kingdom of heaven, which represent it as a visible society composed of good and bad, and predict its outward expansion. He treats of "Church polity and discipline," lays down, as it were, "the rudiments of ecclesiastical law," and shows us Jesus as legislating for the kingdom that He bequeathed to His disciples.

2. Now it is precisely with reference to organization that S. Matthew uses the word 'Church.' Nay, the very steps and gradations of organization are discernible in both passages. The first, that concerning Peter, speaks for itself. The figure is taken from a house, firmly built on a rock, which defies the winds and the storm. Thus the Church is a building, set on a visible rock, Peter, and composed of visible stones, the Apostles and the faithful. It is, as it were, a tower whose foot spurns back the ocean's roaring tides. As a city on a hill is everywhere visible, and offers shelter to all, so the Church built on Peter as a firm foundation, protects and saves the faithful throughout the world. Hence in trying to form an accurate notion of the Church, we must start from this very passage in which the word occurs for the first time, and with a well-defined meaning. "Matthew XVI. 18, not only gave rise to the ideas of Rome's "primacy, but it also caused the idea of the Church to take "rank among the articles of the Apostles' Creed. Thus it "is in every sense, a *sedes doctrinæ* of Catholicism."[a] Is this, perchance the reason why modern critics give an unfavourable verdict on the passage? Those who would maintain that Christ founded what they call a "religious world-wide society, without any theocratic ordinances, sacrifice and priesthood," are forced to deny that this passage, which pre-supposes a more or less "advanced state of social organization," contains the genuine words of Our Lord. But then there are all the other passages, embodying the words addressed to the Apostles and promising the assistance of the Holy Ghost These, surely, are

a Holtzman, *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie*, 1878 p. 113. Schenkel, *Bibel-Lexicon*, III. 377.

the genuine words of Christ, and if so, then it must be admitted that "the external organization was, at all events, the work of "the creative power of His divine Spirit ever present and active "first among his disciples, afterwards among the community at "large."

The other passage, in S. Matthew XVIII. 17, has the advantage of distinctly bringing out the connection between the private and public character of the members of the community. Following up the command to obey the Church as the highest tribunal, Christ adds this assurance: "Amen I say to you, "whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in "heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be "loosed also in heaven. Again I say to you, that if two of you "shall consent upon earth, concerning anything whatsoever they "shall ask, it shall be done to them by my Father Who is in "heaven. For where there are two or three gathered together "in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (18-20). What the passage lays stress on, is the power given to the Apostles, and the Divine and absolute sanction of its exercise. This forbids us to interpret it to mean merely that the community acted through its chosen delegates, or that the Apostles executed the mandate of the people. For not only are these words calculated, as the Old Catholic Langen thinks, to give plausibility to the mistaken notion that Church means directly the hierarchy,[3] but we contend that apart from this consideration, the passage, taken as a whole and in this context, obliges us to think of the Church as connected with the Apostles. Only by disregarding the context, is it possible to wrench the passage and interpret in the interest of opposition to the hierarchy, as happened at Bale and Constance. Even so the Catholic idea of the Church is contained therein, and the further question would be one not of the Church in itself, but of the relation of the Apostles to the whole Church. But, as a

3. Langen, *Das Vaticanische Dogma von dem Universal-Episcopat und der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes.* III. Part. Bonn. 1873, p. 84.

matter of fact, the context definitely singles out the Apostles as men in authority, invested with the judicial office. For this reason S. Chrysostom understands by the "Church" the "presidents," and S. Thomas the prelates.[4] He that heard not the Apostles in the Church is as one cast out of the Church, excommunicated.

We grant indeed that the name "Apostle" is not used, nor do we deny that afterwards the faithful of the Church generally, when assembled in prayer, are assured of Christ's presence. But the "you" in v. 18 must be understood of the Apostles, not of the men offended against, nor of the community; and this for two reasons. Firstly, they are addressed in the plural, while in the previous part of the discourse, which only stated general propositions in the concrete, the singular form is used; secondly, the "disciples" in v. 1 are clearly the "twelve," who were our Lord's constant companions, and formed the foundation of the community. They are represented as having power. Nor can it be concluded from v. 19 that the Apostles are regarded in v. 18 merely as brothers among brothers, and not according to their calling and office. The connection, indeed, between the words in verses 19-20 and the preceding passage is not so clear and obvious; still there is a connecting link, a common thought underlying both. The preceding passage lays stress upon the difference between *public* and private correction, and their respective effects upon the offender. Then our Lord goes on to emphasize the importance and value of public prayer,—the prayer of those who are knitted into one brotherhood by the common bond of faith and love. The bond of faith and love, S. John tells us, must unite the faithful with one another and with Christ. This union, which was first effected in Christ and the Apostles, is at once the pattern and the cause of the union subsisting between the Apostles and the faithful; and both, in turn, are moulded on the union of the Father and the Son. Hence common prayer is possible to none but those

4. S. Th. ii ii.; q. 33. a. 8. *In Cant. exp. alt.* c. i.

who are welded into this brotherhood, the Church, and who confess, as they are here bidden, the power inherent in the Apostles of binding and loosing. In other words a community presupposes an organization instituted by Christ.* Such is the explanation given by S. Cyprian.[5] He, too, had to defend it against the thrusts of heretics and schismatics. We must not, he says, take the text apart from the context. If two of you, it is said, shall consent upon earth; Christ, therefore, puts unity in the first place. But how can the man who is at variance with the whole Church and the brotherhood, be in agreement with any one? How can two or three be gathered together *in the name of Jesus* who are known to be divided from Christ and His Gospel?†

This, then, is the passage to which Gallicans old and new never weary of appealing. So, in like manner, Protestant controversialists boast that this passage enshrines the "great "promise, which, in the teeth of all hierarchical pretensions, "declares that when two or three are gathered together in "Christs' name there is He in the midst of them." According to it, they say, the Church or "congregation" was to be founded by the missionary labours of the Apostles, but it was to govern itself by virtue of Christ who abides in spirit in the midst of

5. *De Unit Eccl.* c. 12.

* The connection between verse 19 and the preceding verses might, perhaps, be stated in a more simple and natural way, thus: in verse 17 it is said that if the offender will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican. This is, of course, a terrible punishment. Why? because whatever you bind on earth is also bound *in heaven* (v. 18), and whatever you ask as members of one brotherhood, will be granted; consequently separation from the brotherhood means that prayer is sterile, the fountain of grace dried up (v. 19). This passage, therefore, as the author argues, implies all along that the Church is a living organism, of which the Apostles are an essential part; and they certainly were endowed with Hierarchical power. (Tr.)

† It is clear that the argument of S. Cyprian, to have any force at all, must needs exclude certain favourite maxims of later days such as: that there can be faith and revealed truth independently of an external, visible and living organisation; that it can be found in more than one organisation; that the community (Church is to be recognized and judged by the faith and not vice-versa; that the one living community can lose the true faith. Such maxims never occured to S. Cyprian, and, excepting the last, probably never entered the mind of his opponents. The fallibility of the Church is, of course, a necessary postulate of separation. (Tr.)

His children.[6] But in this place there is no question whatever of the Apostles founding the Church in their capacity of missionaries. Is it not clearly a question of discipline, of the unity and authority of the Church? The other passage speaks of the foundation of the Church, but not of a "congregation;" and every attempt to interpret it in this manner is foredoomed to failure. We are, therefore, fully entitled to put the same meaning on the same word in both passages, since both speak of the same authority. Nor, again, can it be objected that this authority is cancelled by the promise that follows (v. 19); for then its being put forward with such emphasis in verses 17-18 would be utterly incomprehensible.

3. The other evangelists do not use the word "Church," although Mark and Luke record Peter's confession (VII 27; IX. 18). External circumstances supply the reason why. It was not till late, we observe, and then only before His disciples, that Jesus spoke of the Church He was to found as the new theocracy, lest, had it been prematurely divulged, it might confirm the Jews in their false Messianic hopes. And still greater caution was required in the evangelists who wrote for Gentile Christians. In their accounts of the kingdom of God, they avoided, as we have seen, Matthew's somewhat Jewish phrase "kingdom of heaven." That such was their aim and object is clear from S. John, who not only lays special stress throughout his Gospel on the spiritual character of the kingdom of Jesus, but he has retained the very words in which Jesus, when before Pilate, declared it to be such. (VIII. 36).

But when we come more closely to examine the passages in which the last three Gospels speak of the kingdom of God, whether in its spiritual or in its outward aspect, it is easy to see that they apply to the Church as an external organized society of believers who are in quest of eternal life. This is but natural. For the idea of the Church sets out, indeed,

6. Hase, *Polemik* p. 38. Beyschlag, *Riehms Bibl. Wörterbuch* i. 71. On Gerson, Pierre d'Ailly and others see Schwane, iii. 556, 561, 569 seq.

from external union, such as was manifested in the Old Testament by sacrifice and prayer, legislation and priesthood, but it does not stop there, because the end of this union is essentially spiritual, namely, the realization of the kingdom of God on earth by uniting the society to God by charity, and the faithful with one another in faith, sacrifice and prayer. The distinction between the kingdom of God and the Church does not, as Ritschl will have it, consist in this that the former is internal, the latter external, one appertaining to the domain of morality, the other to that of worship; for such a distinction between outward and inward is unknown to the New Testament.[7] On the contrary, whatever is said in the Gospels of the kingdom of God, must also be true of the Church.

4 Moreover there are several incidents recorded in S. John's Gospel which have always been applied by the allegorical school to the foundation of the Church, and for this reason cannot be passed over in silence. In the first place John alone gives the triple inscription on the Cross (XIX 20), for Luke XXIII. 38 [Vulg.] is a gloss on the text. John undoubtedly meant to convey the idea that Divine Providence had, by this telling circumstance, given expression to the universality of the Church and of the work of redemption. For, Hebrew, as S. Augustine remarks, was the language of the Jews who gloried in the Law; Greek was the language of those who boasted of worldly wisdom, and Latin of the Romans, who were masters of the world. The three forces were to be pressed into the service of the Christian Church. From Judaism there came forth Christ and His foundation, the Church. The universal language of the Greeks made it possible to preach the Gospel everywhere, and the Roman empire supplied the external basis for the universal Christian Church. It was from the cross that these future events cast their shadow. And so we may say with Rupert of Deutz that the inscription was dictated by the Holy Ghost in one sense and written by Pilate

7. See Köstlin, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1888, p. 25.

in another. Who would have thought at that moment that the work of the Crucified was to destroy the Jews, and to subdue the Greco-Roman empire with its much vaunted philosophy and its overwhelming power?

John, again, is the only one to record that the garment of Christ was without seam, woven from the top throughout. (xix. 23). The soldiers who kept watch, whose perquisites the garments of the crucified were, spoke thus among themselves: "Let us not cut it, but let us cast lots for it whose it shall be." In this S. John sees the fulfilment of that word in Scripture: "They have parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture they have cast lots." (Ps. xxi. [xxii.] 19). The explanation of the Fathers and Theologians, though allegorical, is very telling.[8] They see in the seamless garment of Christ a figure of the Church's unity. To preserve this intact has ever been the most sacred duty of the faithful and of the bishops. "We will not cut it," was the reminder the Fathers gave to heretics, warning them not to mangle the mother who had nurtured them.

Another incident related by John about the Mother of Jesus as she stood at the foot of the Cross also admits of application to the Church. "When Jesus therefore had seen His mother "and the disciple standing, whom He loved, He saith to His "mother: Woman, behold thy son. After that He saith to the "disciple: Behold thy mother." (xix. 26). And the Evangelist adds: "And from that hour the disciple took her to his own." By the last words the Evangelist clearly indicated what was the immediate purpose of our Lord's words. How then, it will be asked, can the text be applied to the Church? The application has to be sought not so much in the relation of Mary to John as mother and son, as in the relation in which she stood to Christ, the Redeemer; a relation which imparted to her position the character of universality. S. Ambrose,[9] however, the only

8 Cyprian, *De Un.* c. 7. Jerome, *Ep. 14 ad Dam.* Augustine, *Serm.* 265, 7. Gregory the Great, *Ep. vii. 4.* Felix II. *Ep. I. 3* (ad Jen.) See also Schwane, II. 833.

9 See Schanz, *Commentar zu Johannes*, p. 558. Scheeben, *Dogmatik* III. 605.

one among the Fathers who dilates upon this passage, was stopped short of this application by Ps. LXXXVII. 5. That Mary, the mother of Christ, standing by the Cross, had a share in the work of redemption, is a doctrine that has been held since the days of Irenæus. But it was not till later that Theologians began to see it expressed in these words of Christ given by S. John. After scanning the words more closely they argued, and rightly so, that the fact of John taking Mary unto his own, and providing for her temporal needs, will indeed explain the words: "Son, behold thy mother," but not the words: "Woman, behold thy son." The latter words, therefore, show that by son was meant the church of all the redeemed which was placed under her maternal protection.

Finally, the story of the piercing of the side of Jesus also belongs to this group. In order to make sure that death had ensued, one of the soldiers pierced the side of the Crucified with a spear, and immediately there came out blood and water. (XIX. 34). John specially strengthens the force of his testimony as an eyewitness, because he knew that the fact he had mentioned was the fulfilment of a prophecy. [Zach. XII. 10]. But, in searching for the deeper reason and meaning of this incident, the Fathers generally hold that it signified the foundation of the Church; and they go on to compare it with the creation of Eve from the side of the sleeping Adam, and the opening of the door in the ark through which the animals came forth. The Christian, they say, lives by water and blood: by the one he is born again, by the other nourished. They are the gates of life. Hence the side of Christ was opened, to let water and blood, that is, the Sacraments of the Church, flow forth, whereby she becomes the fertile mother of many children. Thus as the mother of the living was formed from the rib of the sleeping Adam, so from the side of the Crucified, the second Adam, has issued the Church from which streams of life and grace are ever flowing to those who are spiritually united to Christ.[10]

10 See S. Thomas, iii. q. 64, a. 2.

So far we have been dealing with the notion of the Church according to the Gospels.

5. By turning to the Acts of the Apostles we shall be enabled to attain a still clearer and further notion of the Church. For it is here that we get a real insight into the formation and growth of the new community, the nature and development of her constitution as well as her marvellous spiritual energy and power. The dedication, so to speak, of the Church took place on the day of Pentecost. The Holy Ghost descended upon the house in which all the disciples were assembled, and rested on each one. The noise from heaven as of a mighty wind, and the fiery tongues, suggest a parallel with the thunder and lightning when God gave the Law on Mount Sinai. But there is a difference. For, the Spirit speaking in the Apostles is the Spirit promised for the new kingdom by the prophets, setting His seal to the new covenant: a covenant not of the letter but of the Spirit. Though the name Church be wanting, the thing itself stands clearly before our eyes. Those means of salvation—at once external signs of the visible community, and inner medicine for the soul—which Jesus had appointed, were now applied and took their full effect. The words of the sacred text give a glowing description of what was taking place; those who received the word were baptized, and there were "added in that "day about three thousand souls. And they were persevering "in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of "the breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts II. 41. 42).*

* This sketch of the new community is evidently taken at the moment when it was assembled for divine worship. It purports to place before us the new *Kahal* [taking the word in its narrower application], and its new divine service consisting in three main portions, namely: (1) the doctrine of the Apostles [Sermon]; (2) the communication of the breaking of the bread [Eucharistic sacrifice and sacrament]; (3) prayers [psalms, hymns, spiritual canticles, Col. III. 16; supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings, I. Tim. II. 1]. But at the same time the words of the text go far beyond that immediate scope. They also give, as the author argues, an insight into the *organic* character of the new community. Faith received at the hands of divine messengers [evidently a summary faith], and baptism dispensed by the same, are conditions of admission: Perseverance in the doctrine [continuous teaching] of the Apostles is an obligation resulting from the admission. The Eucharist and common liturgical prayer

6. Henceforward the word "Church" is more frequently met with, and is applied both to the Christian community as a whole (universal church), and to each particular community. In other words, the name is given to the whole community, and to each of its parts. After recounting the punishment inflicted on Ananias and Saphira, the sacred writer continues: "And "there came great fear upon the whole Church, and upon all that heard these things." (Acts v. 11). The persecution of the faithful is called a "persecution against the Church." (VIII. 1). "Saul made havoc of the Church, entering in from house "to house, and dragging away men and women committed "them to prison." (VIII. 3). "The church that was at "Jerusalem . . . sent Barnabas as far as Antioch." (XI. 22). "Herod the king stretched forth his hands to "afflict some of the Church." (XII. 1). "Peter therefore was "kept in prison. But prayer was made without ceasing by the "Church unto God for him." (XII. 5). Saul and Barnabas tarried in the Church at Antioch a whole year, and taught a great multitude. (XI. 26). When they returned from their missionary tour they assembled the Church, and related what great things God had done with them. (XIV. 27). They were sent as ambassadors of the Church to Jerusalem (XV. 2. 3), and when they were come, "they were received by the Church and "by the Apostles and ancients." (XV. 4). The decree of the

is the visible sign and seal of their internal unity with one another and with God. These, then, are the organic bonds that linked them to the Apostolic body, which was already in existence as a full and perfect church. Hence the very expressive words of the text: They were *added* [*appositæ*, προσετίυησαν] they were taken up into the previously existing living organism, they were absorbed and assimilated to it. Their accession increased the size and bulk of the Church, but made no change in her form and constitution. The process by which those men were made Christians was an organic process, a parental action; they were children, not merely pupils. (I Cor. IV. 15; Phil. 10). It is of the utmost importance, from an apologetic point of view, to insist on this fundamental fact, which must needs become a law for all times. The manner and method of making Christians being *once* organic, must ever remain so, or to use the language of German Theologians: the formal principle (Das Formal-Princip) by which men become believers and members of Christ's Church, can never change; it must be the same to-day as it was when the first vicar of Christ began to set the first living stones upon himself as the firm and unshaken rock, when the first chief shepherd opened the door of the fold to his sheep. Tr.

Apostolic Council is described as a decree of the "Apostles "and ancients with the whole Church." (XV. 22; XVI. 4). Paul visited the churches in Syria and Cilicia. (XV. 41; XVIII. 22). In one place, however [XIX. 32. 41], the word is used of an ordinary assembly of people.

From this it is easy to see how the idea of the Church, formed after the analogy and on the model of the Old Testament, was first realized in one individual, then in two, and three, and so forth. It thus was at first an individual concept; but, as time went on and communities arose in various towns, it became a general or universal* concept. Not indeed as if the Church as a whole meant no more than a conglomerate of particular churches, each one complete in itself and independent of others, though resembling them; on the contrary, they are all sprung from one stock, daughters of the same mother, boughs from the same trunk. The Church is a divine institution which finds its expression in all those who believe [or, in the words of the Acts, who are added to the existing circle]. But the circle of the faithful is, at first, small, and only gradually does it enlarge itself by admitting new peoples and new places. As long as there were faithful only in Jerusalem, they constituted the whole church. They are called by various names, the faithful, the disciples, the multitude of the believers,

* According to the strict rules of logic, and, indeed, according to the explanation which the author himself immediately gives, the term Church, as used in the Acts, is in no way a general or universal term. For it is essential to a universal term, that it should apply to a number of individuals in exactly the same sense and meaning, [*univoce pluribus competit*] so that each individual realizes the same full meaning of the word. Now this is precisely what the author tries to exclude by his argument and rightly so, because the term Church, taken from the O. T., means the new Kahal, the new divine commonwealth. But, from the very nature of things, if it be a divine organization, it is, and must ever remain one individual being or object [*ens individuum*], no matter how many peoples and places it may embrace. It was the Reformers of the XVI century who made the word Church an universal term. In order to retain the ancient creed "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," they were obliged to start the theory of an invisible church, which is realised in the many and various individual and mutually opposed communions. This theory has taken such root in the Protestant mind, that it has become the source of interminable confusion in our own days, the word Church being now the veritable Babel of the XIX century; every one using it, but no one daring to define it. Yet the matter if viewed historically, is perfectly simple and quite in harmony with the rules

the disciples of the Lord, the brethren, the Apostles and ancients and brethren. These taken together were the Church of Christ, the Christian Kahal or community. But, before long, new portions were added, and formed, after the manner of Jerusalem, into local communities, and these, too, were called not indeed the Church simply, but with a limitation, the Church at Antioch, Iconium, Ephesus, and so forth. Thus the word came to be used of the new community as a whole and of each of its parts. So, for instance, while in Acts IX. 1 the Christians are called the 'disciples of the Lord,' and in IX. 26 simply 'the disciples' (whom Saul after his conversion essayed to join in Jerusalem), and in IX. 30 'the brethren,' in IX. 31 for the first time the word Church is used of all the existing communities [particular churches]: "Now "*the Church* had peace throughout all Judæa and Galilee "and Samaria, and was edified, walking in the fear of the "Lord, and was filled with the consolation of the Holy "Ghost." (IX. 31).

In the same chapter the faithful are also designated 'Saints.' This phrase, too, like 'disciples' and 'brethren,' was borrowed from Jewish usage. Just as the name 'Saints' was assigned to the Jews in the Old Testament because, being God's chosen people and separated from the heathen, they enjoyed God's protection and led lives pleasing in his sight (Daniel VII. 18. 22), so Christians applied the expression to themselves, because God had chosen them from out of the world (John XVII. 14. 16),

of human language. The word Church in itself is a collective term, like family, army, state, and means a divinely organized commonwealth. The object then to which it is applied, is one individual organism such as that which existed in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost; and to this organism it will ever apply, no matter how large or small it may be. It can only grow and increase in one way. Like a state, which is also a moral organism, it grows by drawing new places and new nations within its own organic life. These become part and parcel of the state, and, by a well-known metaphor (*pars pro toto*), they may share in the name of the state So for instance, if the Commonwealth of Cromwell were first established in London and then gradually spread to the Provinces, people would be quite justified in calling the new municipal government of the various towns the Commonwealth. It is precisely in the same sense that Scripture speaks of the church at Antioch, Ephesus, and elsewhere. Any other acceptation of the word Church, whatever else it may be, is not historical. Tr.

in order that, filled with the Holy Ghost, they might merit eternal life by leading holy lives. But as the Jews, God's people and family, or in the language of Scripture, the Son of God, formed a divine commonwealth or Theocracy, so also Christians, the new Israel, formed a new community, the Church.

7. But the *Acts of the Apostles* discloses a still deeper view into the nature of the Church. Besides recording the prominent position held by the Apostles in all the Churches, it gives us a glimpse into the way in which S. Paul, by God's command, organized the Gentile Christian Churches. It relates how he sent from Miletus to Ephesus and summoned the "ancients of the Church" (xx. 17), and how in a stirring farewell address he admonished them in these words: "Take "heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy "Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule *the Church of God*, "which He hath purchased with His own bloood." (xx. 28). Although these were only the ancients set over the Church of Ephesus, still all portions of the Church of God, and consequently the whole Church, were included in the same category. The several Churches together form the Church of Christ, that was purchased by the blood of Jesus and is guided by the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit works organically, that is, through the bishops and ancients of the several Churches, and they must render an account to God of the manner in which they have discharged their duties as pastors and teachers. Bishops and those committed to their charge stand in the same relation to one another as the Apostles and the faithful; they form one Church, the teaching and the listening Church [*Ecclesia docens et discens*]. Even through the complaints lodged by the Jews against the "sects" of Christians there runs the conviction that they are viewing it as a compact and united society, that was threatening the very existence of the Synagogue. Thus runs their complaint to the governor against Paul: "We have found this to be a pestilent man, and raising

"sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and author "of the sedition of the sect of the Nazarenes, who also hath "gone about to profane the temple." (xxiv. 25. 26).

8. S. Paul's writings are of special interest in this question. It was not he, as we have seen, who first originated the idea or term Church. He found it in existence. Speaking of his antecedent career, he says, with a deep feeling of sorrow, that he persecuted the Church of God beyond measure. (I Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13). But as if to atone for his sin, he seems not only to have laboured more than the others for the Church, but also to have made her the subject of his special study. He has, so to speak, applied to her the electric search-light of his wonderfully clear and keen vision, setting forth the glories of her beauty and strength, unlocking the riches of truth and grace that are contained in her name. In order that we may clearly apprehend his statements, it will be well to consider in advance certain phrases that occur in his Catholic epistles. It will be seen that he touches on most of the elements, whether internal or external, spiritual or material, that go to make up the idea of the Church.

We are, of course, quite aware that S. Paul's words on the Church, apply directly to the particular church to which an epistle is addressed. Naturally it is the Church, as embodying a particular community in each place, that comes chiefly into prominence. But even so, it is most important to know in what light he regards it and how he speaks of it. Now he views the particular Church not merely as a gathering of the faithful in one place, but as part of *a brotherhood*, a community of Saints, of men sanctified and called by Christ Jesus [*vocati electi, sanctificati, fratres*]. Thus in the first Epistle to the Corinthians he says: "To the Church of God that is at "Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called "to be Saints, with all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus "Christ in every place of theirs and ours." Again, in the address of the second Epistle he says: "to the Church of God,

"that is at Corinth, *with all the Saints that are in Achaia.*" In the Epistle to the Galatians he thus begins: "Paul, an "Apostle . . . *and all the brethren* who are with me, to "the *churches* of Galatia." Or again, leaving out the word Church, as in the Epistle to the Romans and Ephesians, he addresses "all that are at Rome the beloved of God, called to "be Saints," or, as in the Epistle to the Philippians, "all "the Saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the "bishops and deacons." In the body of the Epistles the term Church frequently occurs with reference to a particular Church.[11] Again, a particular Church is sometimes named after the house in which the community met.[12] That the faithful met in one and the same place is implied in I Cor. XIV. 23 (XIX. 35). Nevertheless, in the eyes of S. Paul, each and all these particular churches are God's possession[13] like the old theocracy. They are but the one Church that is to be in every place, of which the Apostles are the shepherds and teachers.[14] He who persecutes any one of these, persecutes the Church of God, which is the pillar and the ground of truth, and God's true dwelling-place among men. We cannot do better than conclude this paragraph with the words of a modern writer: "Here we find, in the first place, the idea "or principle of tradition. Next, side by side with the ordinary "Pauline teaching (II Tim. II. 19) that the Church is a society "of the elect, we see the visible Church as a community of "good and bad (v. 20). Again we see the Church as a "teaching authority, as an intermediary organ between Christ "and each believer . . . Finally, we have the *ecclesia* "*visibilis* set forth as an article of faith, . . . What is "this but Catholicism in a nutshell?"

11 Romans XVI. 4. 5; I Cor. IV. 17; VI. 4; Col. IV. 16; I Cor. VII. 17; II Cor VIII. 18. 19; XI. 28; Gal. I. 22.

12 Romans XVI. 5; I Cor. XVI. 19; Col. IV. 15; Philemon 2.

13 I Cor. XI. 22: See Numbers XVI. 3; XX. 4.

14 I Cor. XII. 28; Ephes. I. 22; III. 10; V. 22 seq: 27. 29. 32; Philip. III. 6; Col. I. 18. 24.

9. It is a little surprising that the writers of the Catholic Epistles have used the word but seldom (James v. 14; III John IX. 10). Their dedications, when there are such, are more general, as is probably also the case in the second and third Epistles of S. John. "The lady Elect," in the second Epistle, is interpreted by S. Jerome to mean the Church Elect. "The Church that is in Babylon, elected "together with you" (I Peter v. 13) can only be the community with which Peter was staying. The word "Church" is added in the Peschittho, Vulgate, and Sinaitic Codex. As to the expression *synagogue*, used by S. James (II. 2), in the sense of assembly or place of assembly, it is a disputed point among commentators whether it belongs to an earlier or later period. That the Epistle itself belongs to a later period admits of no doubt, for it is clearly based upon the Epistle to the Romans. As, moreover, the "twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," to which the Epistle is addressed, cannot mean the old Israel, so the expression "synagogue" only proves that it was intended for Jewish Christians; and this proof is clenched by its connection with S. Matthew's Gospel. In Hebr. X. 25 the word *ἐπισυναγωγή*, *collectio*, assembly, also occurs; but it is used in contrast to the Jewish synagogue, and denotes the assembly of believers. (II Thess. II. 1). Epiphanius twits the Ebionites with calling their assembly a synagogue instead of a church.[16] Theophilus treasures the "synagogues, which are called "holy churches" as God's bountiful gift to sinful man.[17] In sharp antithesis to this is the Jewish "synagogue of Satan," mentioned by the writer of the Apocalypse, who wrote seven letters to the churches of Asia, to the "Angel of the Church," announcing the revelation that God had made to him in secret. For the rest, James himself gives the best explanation when he exhorts the faithful to call in the priests of the *church* to pray over the sick and anoint them with oil.

16 *Haer.* xxx. 18. Pseudo-Ignat. ad Polyc. iv. 2.
17 *Ad Autol.* ii. 14.

10. In the foregoing pages we have briefly surveyed the usage to which the word church is subjected in the writings of the New Testament. We now proceed to set forth the more minute explanations supplied by the same writings, especially by the Pauline Epistles, concerning the nature and character of the Christian Church. And in the first place, that the Church was a positive institution, founded by Christ, and by Him alone, is sufficiently indicated in the words: Church *of God*, *of the Lord*. For it is self-evident to all Christians that Christ alone is the corner-stone and foundation of the Church. He is the object as well as the cause of faith. He is the source of all grace and justification. The Apostles are but the dispensers of his mysteries, the organs whereby both faith and grace are imparted to mankind. This fundamental truth is written in lines of light in the New Testament. In the first part of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, S. Paul is at great pains to make it clear to the faithful at Corinth that they must call themselves no more after him than after Cephas or Apollo, for he preached Christ crucified, and they were baptized in Christ, not in Paul or Cephas. These are but God's ministers. It is God who gives the increase in the souls of the faithful, who are in reality God's husbandry, God's building. The minister is not the master. Other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus.

S Paul employs two metaphors which depict with beauty and force the nature and character of the Christian Church. The first is an *edifice*, the second an *organic body*. But he originated neither. Both were already suggested by the Gospels. S. John's Gospel forestalled the organism, and our Lord's words recorded in S. Matthew foreshadowed the building. The two together, like soul and body, combine in a most striking manner the outward and inward, the visible and the invisible elements, of the one living Church.

11. Matthew relates that Jesus promised to build His Church on the rock, Peter, and to give to him, as the steward

of His household, the keys. In the same Gospel Jesus reminds His adversaries of the passage in the Psalm (CXVIII. 29. 30): "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the "head of the corner. By the Lord this hath been done and it "is wonderful in our eyes." (XXI. 42). Therefore the kingdom of heaven shall be taken from the Jews and given to others. Now, what is this kingdom of heaven but the "House of God," which the Jews built in the Old Testament, and Christ renewed? For Christ is the high-priest over the house of God; faithful to Him that made Him, as was also Moses in all His house.[18] Christ as the Son of God is set over His house, which house are we. (Hebr. III. 6) David, when he was hungry, entered into the house of God, the Tabernacle.[19] God styles the Temple as His house,[20] as He called Israel His people, His Son. God pitched his tent among the Israelites; other people were strangers, banished from their father's house. But now the wall of separation has been broken down, and all men, Jews and heathens alike, are fellow-citizens of one kingdom, forming one household, one compact living temple.

From these foreshadowings in the Old Testament, and from our Lords' words chronicled by S. Matthew, S. Paul has drawn out in detail a sketch of the building of the Church. He, himself, according to the grace given him, as a wise architect, laid the foundation stone Christ Jesus, and erected a building of gold and silver and precious stones. (I Cor. III. 10 seq.) Hence Christians are God's building. "You are no more "strangers and foreigners, but you are fellow-citizens with the "saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of "the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the "chief corner-stone; in Whom all the building being framed "together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord." (Eph. II. 19-22). One and all are the temple of the all-holy God.

18. Hebr. x. 21; iii. 2. See Deuter. xxvi. 15. Bar. ii. 16.
19. Math. xii. 4. Mc. ii. 26. L. vi. 4.
20. Ps. lvi. 7. Jer. vii. 11. See M. xxi. 13. Mc. xi. 17. L. xix. 46. I. ii. 16 seq

"Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the "Spirit of God dwelleth in you? But if any man violate the "temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of "God is holy; which you are." (I Cor. III. 16-17). "What "agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For you are "the temple of the living God, as God saith: I will dwell in "them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they "shall be my people." (II Cor. vi. 16). And the apostle writes to his beloved disciple Timothy that he may know how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth (I Tim. III. 15). "For the time is that judgment should begin "at the house of God." (I Pet. IV. 17).

And here we may appropriately insert the majestic language in which S. Peter, following up the Old Testament ideas of the House of God, its priesthood and sacrifices, its priestly families and priestly people, describes the dignity and the blessings of the new spiritual temple built on Christ, the corner-stone. "Unto whom coming, as to a living stone, rejected indeed by "men, but chosen and made honourable by God. Be ye also as "living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. "Wherefore it is said in the Scripture: Behold I lay in Sion a "chief corner-stone, elect, precious. And he that shall believe "in Him shall not be confounded. To you therefore that believe "is honour; but to them that believe not, the stone which the "builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner, "and a stone of stumbling and a rock of scandal. . . . "But you are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy "nation, a purchased people." (I Pet. II. 4-9). This is not the place to descant on the universal priesthood. Suffice it to point out that the faithful, resting on Christ the corner-stone, form that chosen community which was once "Jahve's possession," a living building which has derived from its corner-stone the irresistible might and strength of heavenly light and

virtue. As long as the faithful are built up in this house, they serve in the language of S. Paul, "unto the edifying of the Church," (I Cor. XIV. 12), to the building up of the body of Christ. (I Cor. XII. 12 seq).

12. This brings us to the second metaphor. The essential characteristic of an organism, as opposed to a machine, is that it has life. The living stones, built up unto the house of God, perform their work and function each in his own place, but only in conjunction with one another and with the corner-stone. Nevertheless the edifice only brings home to us the external aspect of the visible community, while the other metaphor serves admirably to bring out the internal living connection of all parts with one another and with Christ, for the Church is not only a living body, but is also the body of Christ. This internal connection has already been pointed out in another metaphor, namely the parable of the vine. The Spirit of Christ is, as it were, the soul of the Church, infusing new life into all the members. To illustrate the mutual interaction in the Church, to show unity and diversity, grace and liberty working in mysterious harmony in the several members and in the Church at large, S. Paul employs the simile of the Body and the Head. Menenius Agrippa, as we know, told the fable of the belly and the members in order to make it clear that the several members of the body are mutually dependent and indispensable one to the other, and thus to deter the Plebs from compassing their destruction, by persisting in their foolhardy secession.

The illustration used by the Apostle is similar indeed but much more noble as the head is above the belly, or the spirit above matter. The purpose, too, which the Apostle had in view, is the noblest and highest possible. He wishes to show that one and the same divine Spirit controls the manifold workings of grace in the Church. "For as the body is one, "and hath many members, and all the members of the body, "whereas they are many, yet are one body so also is Christ. For

"in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews "or Gentiles, whether bond or free, and in one spirit we have "all been made to drink. For the body also is not one "member, but many . . . . Now you are the body of "Christ, and members of member. And God indeed hath "set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, "thirdly doctors. . . . Are all apostles? are all prophets? "are all doctors.?"[21] Christ "is the head of the body, the "Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; "that in all things He may hold the primacy (Coloss. I. 18; "III. 15). The Father hath made Him head over all the "Church, which is His body, and the fulness of Him who "is filled all in all." (Ephes. IV. 22 seq.) And the goal is the perfect man (Ephes. IV. 13), in whom the members, who have been made partakers of the fulness of Christ have grown up. Just as the body, which at first is small and weak, has within it the disposition to grow into a fully developed man, so the Church, at first a tiny organism, has received from her head the power to develop as long as the kingdom of God shall last and, like individual Christians, to reach that mature age in which Christ, who fills all in all, dispenses all the treasures of His grace. Of a truth there is one spirit at work in the members, in each Church, and in the whole Church! Could the union of the God-man with the faithful the faithful and with His Church be depicted in more glowing colours?

13. In order to set in a still clearer light the intimate union that subsists between Christ and His Church, S. Paul, adds another metaphor, closely akin to the former, namely, the matrimonial union. Here, again, he was but taking pattern by the Old Testament and the Gospel. Who, in reading the Old Testament, and more especially the prophets, has not been struck by the frequency with which a simile is borrowed from marriage—and adultery? The union between

21 I Cor. xii. 12-31. Rom. xii. 5. Gal. iii. 28.

Jahve and His people bears the character of an espousal or marriage.[22] Jahve is a jealous God, wreaking vengeance for His people's infidelity. The Canticle of Canticles describes with varied Oriental colouring, the relations between bride and bridegroom. True, the New Testament contains no allusion to this, but Christian Theology has, from early times, explained it allegorically of Christ's intimate relations with faithful souls, with the Church, and with Mary. This was all the more natural, as the New Testament actually describes our Lord as the bridegroom. "He that hath the bride is the "bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom who standeth "and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bride- "groom's voice. This my joy is therefore fulfilled." (John III. 29). To the Pharisees who complained that His disciples did not fast Jesus replied: "Can the children of the bride- "groom mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? "But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken "away from them, and then they shall fast." (Matth. IX. 15). Jesus is the bridegroom who comes in the middle of the night and takes the wise virgins to the marriage (XXV. 10.)

The writer of the Apocalypse, filled as he was with the spirit of both the Old and the New Testament, beheld in ecstatic vision this heavenly marriage, "Alleluia! for the Lord our "God, the Almighty hath reigned. Let us be glad and rejoice, "and give glory to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, "and his wife hath prepared herself. And it is granted to "her that she should clothe herself with fine linen glittering "and white. For the fine linen are the justifications of saints." (xix. 6-8.) John saw the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her bride- groom, and he heard a great voice saying: "Behold the taber- "nacle of God with men, and He will dwell with them. And "they shall be His people, and God Himself with them shall "be their God." (XXI. 2, 3.) And one of the seven angels said

22 Is. liv. 6. lxii. 5. Os. ii. 1 seq. especially verses 19-22.

to him: "Come, and I will show thee the bride, the wife of "the Lamb. And he took me up in spirit to a great and high "mountain; and he showed me the holy city, the new "Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, having "the glory of God."(XXI. 9-11). Here, indeed, he has more in view the end of the Church; still it is that same bride whom Jesus chose when He began His public ministry,—the Church of the New covenant, gathered together from the scattered Jewish remnant, and decked out among the heathen with truth and holiness.

By thus dwelling on God's covenant with man, S. Paul hoped to bring home to the faithful the exalted dignity and consequent duties of Christian marriage as well as the dignity and duties of the Church to her bridegroon. "The husband is the "head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. He is "the saviour of His body. Therefore as the Church is subject "to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all "things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the "Church, and delivered Himself up for it, that He might "sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of 'life. That He might present it to Himself a glorious Church "not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should "be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love "their wives as their own bodies. . . . For no man ever "hated his own flesh, but nourisheth it and cherisheth it, as "also Christ doth the Church, because we are members of His "body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man "leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and "they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament; "but I speak in Christ and in the Church." (Ephes. v. 23-31).

Howsoever we explain the "*Sacrament*" (μυστήριον) it is clear from the Greek text that the union of man and wife, as established by God in Paradise, is taken as the model of Christs' inward living union with His bride, the Church. It was the Creator's design from the beginning to make that union

the foundation of the union between God and man, that is, of the Church. (I Cor. II. 6. seq.) And this union was realized first in the Incarnation itself, and next in the Church. For by uniting Himself to the Church, by adorning her as His own body, by cleansing and sanctifying her, the God-man continues in a mysterious manner the work of the Incarnation,—the union of God with man. As the nature which He assumed, was in some sense not an individual, but rather the entire and common human nature, ("*Compendium totius humani generis*") so also has He united the body of the Church in an especial manner to Himself. How magnificently the Apostle conceived this significance of the Incarnation for all time and all places is seen in the introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians: "As He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, "that we should be holy and unspotted in His sight in charity. "Who had predestinated us unto the adoption of children "through Jesus Christ unto Himself, according to the purpose "of His will." (I. 4-5). "According to His good pleasure "which He hath proposed in Him, in the dispensation of the "fulness of times, to re-establish all things in Christ that are in "heaven and on earth, in Him." (I. 9-10).

14. The Church, then, according to the Apostle, is the continuation of the Incarnation, and the medium by which redemption is brought home to mankind. Or is this grand idea, this deep conception of the Church as the intermediary of mankind in the work of redemption, perchance, a later idea of the Apostle, or maybe of a writer, whose mind was already warped by later developments in the Catholic Church? Such, indeed, is the opinion of some critics; but in proof they offer naught but their own subjective ideas of the apostolic and post-apostolic age. The letters written by S. Paul during his imprisonment, are, it is true, written in a calmer vein, in a more general and reflective mood. Yet they are but the natural outcome of the teaching that was contained in the earlier Epistles, and was instinct with life. There are no ideas or ordinan-

ces absolutely new in his later writings, none that may not be found in germ in the earlier Epistles. This is particularly the case with his doctrine concerning the Church. God had chosen and called him, that he might acquire from amidst the corrupt heathen world a bride pure and spotless, and worthy of the divine bridegroom. "For I am jealous of you "with the jealousy of God. For I have espoused you to "one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to "Christ." (II Cor. XI. 2). By being united to the God-man, the faithful attain that noble end which the Creator proposed to the human race and for which the saints of the Old Testament yearned. God became man, in order to give men a share in the divine nature, and thereby unite humanity to Himself as His bride, the Church. "For all are yours, and "you are Christ's, and Christ is God's." (I Cor. III. 22. 23). The work will be complete at the end of time, when Christ shall render all things to God. Then will the great marriage feast be solemnized, and the bride of Christ, like His own body, will enter into everlasting glory. For Christians "are "come to Mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, "the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many "thousands of angels, and to the Church of the first-born, "who are written in the heavens, and to God the judge of "all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus "the mediator of the New Testament, and to the sprinkling of blood which speaketh better than that of Abel." (Heb. XVI. 22-24).

15. All these similitudes are something more than mere rhetorical figures of speech and poetical images. Underlying them is a reality,—a reality full of depth and beauty, because intimately bound up with the very basis and essence of Christianity. That basis is the Incarnation of the Son of God. Now to the ordinary believer there is nothing more real and historical than the fact that God's own Son was truly born in time, that He preached and worked miracles in Palestine; that

He died on the cross and rose again from the dead. In like manner, the ordinary believer is equally certain, that the Church which he had acquired as His bride at such a great cost, and left in His place, is a reality like Himself; the real union of men called to participate in the divine nature. As His human nature is united to the divine in one person, so the Church is intimately penetrated, renewed and sanctified by the divine power of the bridegroom. The outward and the visible can no more be separated from the inward and the invisible than the body in the living organism can be separated from the soul, or Christ's human nature from His divine. Therefore whatever the Apostle expressed in the various figures we have been considering, is but the bare truth. The Church is the copy of Christ Himself. It is not a mere heap of atoms blown together anyhow, it is an organic visible body, with members superior and inferior, moulded, shaped, and joined together by Christ, and it is living with life divine, having the same Spirit that Christ had. Thus the two constituent elements of the Church, the external and internal, are inseparably united, depending and interacting on each other.

16. That such is the Church described in the New Testament, is furthermore confirmed by a consideration of the religious life which the Acts and the Epistles represent the early Christians as leading. In the beginning the Apostles and the faithful in Jerusalem still continued to keep up their connection with the temple. They went up to the temple to pray; they observed the ceremonial law and circumcision; and kept the feasts with solemnity. It would seem that the respite our Lord had granted to Judaism had not as yet expired. The new Israel, being born and formed on the soil of the old, was connected with it by many ties,* and the time had not yet come

* It would appear, however, that even while they assembled in the temple, they formed a congregation of their own. "And they were all with one acoord in Solomon's porch. But of the rest, no man durst *join* himself unto them (κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς); but the people magnified them." Acts v. 13.—*Tr*

for a final and complete severance. Still all the preparations for a new life, and a new Christian worship were complete. All the faithful instinctively felt that they were citizens of a new kingdom. "They were persevering in the doctrine of the "Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread "and in prayers." (Acts II. 42). The breaking of the bread and prayers imply that the Christians assembled at a definite place. Such a place was the upper room, the house in which they were all assembled (Acts I. 13; II. I.; IV. 31); or again the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, whither Peter turned his steps after his miraculous release from prison (Acts XII. 11). From S. Paul we learn (Gal. II. 9) that when he came to Jerusalem those who seemed to be pillars (see I Tim. III. 5), James, Cephas, and John, gave him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (κοινωίνας=communionis). This is borne out by what is said in the Epistles of assemblies (churches) in private houses. The celebration of the sacred mysteries is assigned as the reason for assembling. (I Cor. XI. 18; XIV. 19, 34, 35). The same is clear from the remark: "And con-"tinuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking "bread from house to house, they took their meat with glad-"ness and simplicity of heart." (Acts II. 46). Clearly then the Christians formed a community of their own with their own form of worship.

17. The breaking of bread was not an ordinary meal, but the divine meal instituted by our Lord. This phrase occurs once in the Gospels, and recalls its connection with the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. The disciples at Emmaus recognized Jesus in the breaking of bread. It is a debatable point whether it refers here to an ordinary meal or to the Holy Eucharist; but in any case the phrase in the Acts cannot be construed of an ordinary meal. For, if it were, the conjunction of the breaking of bread with the doctrine of the Apostles and Prayer would be meaningless. Again, on one occasion, when the brethren were assembled to break

bread, it is related that S. Paul gave a discourse. (Acts xx. 7). And we learn from the first Epistle to the Corinthians that by this is meant the Eucharist. "The chalice of benediction "which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of 'Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the "partaking of the body of the Lord. For we, being many, "are *one* bread, *one* body, all that partake of one bread." (I Cor. x. 16. 17). In the following chapter the Apostle speaks of the Lord's supper in such a way, that the idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice is forced upon the mind of the reader. He compares it with the sacrificial meals of the heathen, just as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to the majority of commentators, he contrasts it with the Jewish sacrifices: "We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who "serve the tabernacle," and this shows that it was not an ordinary religious act, nor an ordinary meal flavoured with religious rites. It was a true sacrifice of thanksgiving according to the order of Melchisedech, a pure sacrifice, that is offered to God in all places. Weizsäcker acknowledges this by saying that the Eucharistic celebration "became a real thank-offering, "a symbol and a proof of the fact that the kingdom of God "had come to them, and had begun to dominate and sway "their whole natural and social life."[23]

Our Lord Himself imparted to the "Lord's supper" the character of outward and inward communion with Himself. In remembrance of the Jewish Paschal lamb, the proper sacrifice of the covenant, which, together with its sacrificial meal (communion), formed the basis of the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament, He represented Himself as the New Paschal lamb, and His sacrifice as the foundation of all sacrificial worship, and as the communion of the new and everlasting Covenant. "As the Paschal meal was the feast of the deliver-"ance and a meal of life for the people—a meal wherein they "showed forth their communion with God, so this transformed

23 *Das Apostal. Zeitalter.* Freiburg, 1887. p. 44.

"Paschal meal became the sacrificial meal for the people of "the New Testament, in which the faithful, by eating our "Lord's body, participated in a substantial way in the great "sacrifice, received forgiveness of sins, were cleansed and "sanctified, were united as members to the body whose head "is Christ, and were enabled to offer themselves up in sacrifice "to their appeased God."[24] This eating in common the bread come down from heaven, besides strengthening the bonds of union among the faithful against the synagogue, would also impart fresh life and vigour to their own spiritual union with one another and with their head. In this bloodless continuance of the sacrifice of the cross, and the participation in it by holy communion, the Incarnation ever endures, inasmuch as it unites mankind with God in the body of Christ. The holy Eucharist is the best proof that the Church really perpetuates the work of the God-man, and that her office is to incorporate all humanity in Christ's body which is the Church. Thus, the religious life of the early Christians shows clearly that they formed an external community endowed with internal divine life. They were a real living body, even the body of Christ.

18. In full and perfect harmony with the two-fold character of the Christian community, is, likewise, the promise and gift of the Holy Ghost. The disciples had been told, that when brought before tribunals they were not to take heed what they should say, for the Holy Spirit would teach them. This Paraclete, so often promised, came down visibly in a mighty sign on the Apostles and the faithful. And the first-fruits were the three thousand who were baptized. Again and again the faithful learnt by experience, in time of trials, or when interests affecting the whole community were at stake, that the Holy Spirit was abiding not merely within the Church, but that His presence would manifest itself externally and become a tower of

24 Döllinger, *Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*. Regensburg, 1860 p. 38.

strength and encouragement to them. "And when they had "prayed, the place was moved wherein they were assembled, "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spoke "the word of God with confidence." (Acts IV. 31). Ananias and Saphira lied to the Holy Ghost, and tempted the Spirit of the Lord. (V. 3-9). The deacons were men full of faith and the Holy Ghost. (VI. 5). Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost, and looking up steadfastly to heaven saw the glory of God. (VII. 55). The Apostles prayed for those whom Philip the Deacon had baptized, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying: Give me also this power. (VIII. 15-19). "While Peter was yet speaking these words" in the house of Cornelius, "the Holy Ghost fell upon all them that heard the "word. And the faithful of the Circumcision were astonished "for that the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the Gentiles "also. For they heard them speaking with tongues and mag-"nifying God." (X. 44-46).

And if it be asked in what precise manner this communication of the Spirit was connected with the ecclesiastical community (Church), the answer is supplied by what we read of the ordination in the Church of Antioch. "There were in the "Church which was at Antioch prophets and doctors." "And "as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy "Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the "work whereunto I have taken them. Then they fasting and "praying, and imposing their hands upon them, sent them "away." (XIII. 1-3). When therefore the Apostles and ancients, assembled in Council at Jerusalem write: "It hath seemed "good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (XV. 28), their intention is not merely to lay stress on the general action of the Holy Spirit on the faithful, but to declare that the Church (that is her teachers and rulers) is guided in an especial manner by the

Holy Ghost. S. Paul also tells us that his missionary course was directed by the Holy Spirit.[25]

Of the working of the charismata among the Gentile Christians none knew better than he. He even found it necessary to warn them not to set too great a store by the charismatic gifts, but above all to keep the inward temple of the Holy Ghost pure and undefiled. He enumerates all these multiform inward workings and outward manifestations of the Spirit, and views them in their unity of source and purpose, in order to impress upon the faithful the fact that the Church is an united organism; that inward grace is joined with outward signs; that they are means whereby the faithful are united with one another and with God and Christ, so as to form one great family. "Now there are diversities of graces but the same "Spirit; and there are diversities of ministries but the same "Lord; and there are diversities of operations but the same "Lord Who worketh all in all" (I Cor. XII. 4-6). "One body "and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, "who is above all, and in us all. But to every one of us is "given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ." (Ephes. IV. 4-7). And lest they should forget that besides the gifts common to all or to many there are special gifts proper to some only, as, for instance, those connected with the ministry of the stewardship of God's house, the Apostle adds: "And "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some "evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the per-"fecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the "edifying of the body of Christ." (v. 11-12).

19. This external organisation founded by Christ, and completed by the Apostles under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has been found eminently useful and necessary for the continuance of the one, holy and universal Church. How could the Apostle's work in founding churches have endured, if he had

25 Acts xvi. 6-7 xxi. 11.

not really and closely connected them with one another and with the first Church? How soon a new and inexperienced Church, if isolated, would have succumbed to the scorn and derision of its heathen neighbours! When laying down laws the Apostle frequently appeals in support of his authority to the word of the Lord, and to the Holy Spirit within him. In like manner he appeals to his work in the various churches that he had founded. And surely nothing was more calculated to give weight and recommendation to his commands than the success achieved in other churches. The Apostle wished that in all newly erected churches the same decrees should hold good, so that there might be not only oneness in faith and sacraments, but also uniformity in worship and religious exercises. He prays for his churches, and asks them in turn to pray for him; he asks them to pray for one another, and to hold out a helping hand to one another. This last he bases on the new precept of brotherly love (I Cor. XIII), which the Christians in Jerusalem had so signally illustrated by holding their goods in common. Though the institution was not perfect, as we learn from the causes that led to the appointment of deacons, still, even such as it was, in a world rotten to the core with selfishness, it was an astounding proof of the power of the Holy Ghost.

As the Gentiles had received the spiritual gift of the Gospel from Jerusalem, so they were to be constantly reminded of their unity with the primitive Church by contributing their mite, in token of gratitude, for the relief of the poor in Jerusalem. S. Paul relates that in the partition of missionary districts no other duty was laid on him than that he should be mindful of the poor; which same thing he was careful to do. (Galat. II. 10). Is it not a touching sight to see the Apostle who spent himself in God's service, and supported himself by the labour of his hands, pleading so earnestly with the new converts on behalf of the Saints? to see the poor Gentile Christians—for how few were the rich who were converted!—

place their mite in the poor-box every Sunday, in order that the Apostle might have offerings to take to Jerusalem?[26] There is only one other instance analogous to this, and it is given by Josephus, who records that the Jews of the Dispersion sent rich presents every year to the temple in Jerusalem, in order to honour God, and to put in evidence that they belonged to the chosen people. Naturally, in the kingdom of the Holy Spirit, external duties sank into relative insignificance, giving place to internal and moral; still they did not altogether disappear. This only shows that even a spiritual community, existing in the world, cannot disentangle itself from its external ties, as the Apostle's frequent journeys to Jerusalem decisively prove. Finally, by giving special prominence in *Galatians* to his relations with Peter, he sufficiently indicates the point in which the particular churches scattered all over the world are in future to find a centre of unity. The Epistle to the Romans also contains remarkable testimony on this head.

20. From this general exposition, which will in many respects be completed as we proceed, we may now glean some sort of a *definition* of the Church. The Church is a visible community built by Christ on the rock Peter, and on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, consisting of believers who, united in one body with Christ their head by baptism, profess the same faith, use the same means of grace, obey the same laws and ordinances, in order to shew forth the kingdom of God and to attain eternal life. This definition cannot be made more concise until we have examined more carefully and minutely the several constituent points included therein. After what has been already said concerning the kingdom, it will be needless to observe that loss of baptismal grace does not entail loss of membership of the visible Church, and conversely that membership is not an infallible guarantee of eternal life. And here, perhaps, it is right that we should pass in review some definitions of leading

26 I Cor. xvi. 1 3. II Cor. ix. 1. Rom. xv. 26

Theologians. Neither the Council of Trent nor the Vatican Council has formulated a definition of the Church. In the catechism of the Council of Trent there is a paragraph which contains the salient points: "The Church militant is the "society of all the faithful still living on earth. In the Church "militant there are two sorts of men, the good and the bad, "and the bad indeed profess the same faith, and partake of "the same sacraments as the good, differing in their lives and "morals. In the Church they are called the good, who are "joined and bound together not only by the profession of the "same faith, and the participation of the same sacraments, "but also by the spirit of grace and the bond of charity."[27] The words used by the Vatican Council in the beginning of its first dogmatic constitution on the Church have the same bent. "The Eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to "continue for all time the life-giving work of His Redemption, "determined to build up the Holy Church, wherein, as in the "House of the living God, all who believe might be united in "the bond of one faith and one charity."*

According to Hugh of S. Victor the Church is the society of all who believe in Christ; the one body of Christ, of which Christ Himself is the head, and the Holy Spirit the principle that gives it life, light and warmth. The Scholastics, headed by S. Thomas, draw a distinction between the visible Church on earth, and the invisible Church in heaven. The Church on earth, they say, is both a copy and a type of the Church in heaven. As the glorified God-man is the head of the latter, so Christ's visible representative on earth is the head of the former. The *invisible* Church is the society of all the children of God, who are united with Christ their head by faith and charity. It bears the name of Church by analogy. The relation in which the two Churches stand to each other is clear: the Church in heaven or the invisible Church is the goal and ideal to be

27 Part I. c. x.; q. 5 and 6. (Donovan's Translation).

* Cardinal Manning's Translation.

attained in and through the visible Church on earth.[28] The latter—that is, the Church properly so called—which we have considered in the foregoing pages, is, as S. Thomas says, both a copy and type of the heavenly Jerusalem.

Of the definitions given by Theologians, who have written since the rise of Protestantism, two are mostly in repute and deserve consideration. Bellarmine stands sponsor for the one, Mohler for the other. They differ in this, that one lays stress on the external, while the other gives prominence to the internal element. Bellarmine's definition runs thus: "In our opinion "the one true Church is the union of men bound together by "the same Christian faith, having the same sacraments, and "under the guidance of a law-giving shepherd and of Christ's "vicar on earth." Möhler gives the general definition: "By "the Church on earth, Catholics understand the visible com-"munity of believers, founded by Christ, in which, by means "of an enduring Apostleship, established by Him, and appoin-"ted to conduct all nations, in the course of ages, back to "God, the works wrought by Him during His earthly life, for "the redemption and sanctification of mankind, are, under the "guidance of His Spirit, continued to the end of the world." Möhler continues: "Thus to a visible society of men is this "great, important and mysterious work entrusted. The ulti-"mate reason of the visibility of the Church is to be found in "the Incarnation of the Divine Word."[29] The visible Church is the Son of God ever abiding among men in a human form, ever renewing His youth,—a lasting incarnation. Thalhofer follows him, and defines the Church as "Christ manifesting "Himself and enduring for ever in all places as the centre "of humanity."

21. Non-Catholic definitions all agree in denying or under-

28 See Schwane III. 495 seq.

29 Bellarm., *De Eccles milit.* c. ii. (*De Controv.* Tom. II. l. iii. c. 2). Möhler, *Symbolism*, Translated by J. B. Robertson, Vol. II. ch. v. § 36 p. 5. Thalhofer, *Liturgik*, I. 11. See Rösler, *Prudentius*, p. 40. S. Thom. III. q. 8. a. 1. 2. Petav., *de Incarn.* xii. 17. S. Athan., *de Incarn.* c. xxi.

rating, in a greater or less degree, the element of visibility, and thereby render a Church on earth with an external organization impossible. With them the Church of Christ, the Church universal, is invisible, and is commonly limited to those who are living members of Christ's invisible body, or who, at all events, have not fallen from the faith. These last, for instance, were by the Donatists, who tolerated other sinners, excluded from the society of the saints. Consequently, as Augustine argued, the Donatists must renounce all idea of a Church, because no man is without sin. The Novatians, Cathari, Petrobrusians and others, on the contrary, limited the Church to the pure and holy, that is, they made it entirely an invisible Church. The Pelagians also, though from a different standpoint and in a different sense, generally described the Church as the union of the perfect and the sinless. Wicliff, Hus and Calvin limited the Church to the *predestined*. Luther likewise taught an invisible Church living in spirit in a sphere to which no man has access. "I believe in a holy Church on earth, which "is not only under the Pope, but is also among Turks, "Persians, and Tartars; and though scattered all over the "world is spiritually united under one head, Jesus Christ." In the Confession of Augsburg it is said: "The Church is the "assembly of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly preached, "and the sacraments rightly administered." To this, however, the Apology thought it necessary to append the following gloss: "The Church is not a mere communion of rites and "externals, like other states, but is essentially a communion of "those who have faith and the Holy Spirit in their hearts; and "yet it has withal external marks by which it can be known, to "wit, the pure Gospel teaching, and, in conformity with this "Gospel, the administration of the sacraments." But the Smalcaldian articles outstrip all. In them it is said: "For, "God be thanked, a seven-year old boy in these days knows "what the Church is: namely, the believers, the saints, and the "lambs that hear the shepherd's voice."[30]

30 *Confess Aug.* I 7. *Apol.* c. 4. a. 5. *Art. Smalc.* p. iii. a. 12. *Catech. Major* p. ii. a. 2. See Hase, *Polemik*, p. 3 seq.

Since the so-called Reformation, and the origin of sects and communities innumerable, it has become extremely difficult to frame a definition of the Church that will meet with general acceptance. Hence the definitions vary according as stress is laid on the outward or inward elements. These again depend, in each case, on the peculiar standpoint and attitude assumed by the various communities; some cleaving to symbolic confessions, others being tinged with rationalism. One thing is clear, that there is no agreement whatever upon even the most important points.[31] Nowadays it is usual among non-Catholics to regard the several churches as more or less successful representatives of the ideal Church to which we are ever tending, but which we never reach.[32]

31 See Röhn, *Confessionelle Lehrgegensätze*, P. ii. p. 8.

32 See Hase, p. 7. Martensen, Thiersch, Schenkel, and others. So also the Puseyites. See Prop. xviii. of the Syllabus: "Protestantism is nothing else, but a different form of the same true Christian religion; a form in which one can please God as well as in the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

1. Christ founded but one Church, and He wished it to endure to the end of time. Just as belief in one God is a first principle in religion and a self-evident truth, because there can be only one Supreme Being, so from the very nature of things all believers in Christianity must also hold, as a first principle, that the one God, Lord and Redeemer has established but one kingdom of God on earth. But human wickedness bartered the one true God for created idols, the works of man's hands. Hence arose the necessity of commanding the Israelites to believe in the true God and no other. So, in like manner, the same fate awaited the Church of Christ. Our Lord Himself foresaw wolves in sheep's clothing, seducers and Anti-christs; the Apostles saw them at their deadly work, and predicted the disasters that would ensue. False Christs and false Churches have arisen. Hence the common moral duty of belonging to the Church of Christ, practically resolves itself into the duty of distinguishing the one true Church from all counterfeits.

2. How then is the Church of Christ to be known? Our Lord once gave a test for detecting false prophets: "By their "fruits you shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, "or figs of thistles?" (Matth. VII. 16). If this general test applies to individuals, it must, in a measure, also apply to a religious party, or sect, or community. The true Church,

therefore, will be known from the false by its fruits. What sort of fruits? All works done according to the will of God, which Christ revealed to men. God is holy, and men who wish to come to Him must also be holy. Christ has shown the way of holiness; for He is the way, the truth, and the life. He has ordained the means by which holiness is engendered and fostered: for He alone can be the source and cause of supernatural sanctity. Thus, then, holiness is union with Christ, that is, *holiness* and *unity* are the necessary characteristics of all true disciples of Jesus. These are the marks that He asked and obtained from His Father for the disciples and the faithful that He had gathered round Him, and for the multitudes that in after-ages through their word would believe, and join their Society. These two marks, therefore, *must* necessarily belong to His Church.* Hence we find that the Apostles exacted these two conditions from the faithful, and, in frequent exhortations, insisted upon them with special emphasis. S. Paul, as we have seen, describes the Church as the one bride of Christ, holy and undefiled, without spot or wrinkle. Moreover, as Christ died for all men, and wished all to be saved, so the means of salvation wrought by Him must benefit all, and be brought within the reach of all peoples and all ages. Although He Himself confined His ministry to Palestine, He authorized and empowered the Apostles to act in His name and in His place, and to carry on His work for all ages to the ends of the earth. From none other but those, whom He Himself had instructed, and who had received the Holy Ghost, could the world learn the divine will as made known by Jesus. By submitting to the teaching and authority of these His representatives, the world was to render obedience to Christ

* Catholics are constantly met with the objection that they argue *a priori*. Thus the Reviewer of Stanton's work on 'The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief' in the April Number of *The Thinker*, 1892, p. 334. This is not true except in so far as we apply what are, indeed, *necessary laws of thought*, among which the *principle of contradiction* certainly holds the first place. It is not the *a priori* argument we lay stress upon, but rather the unity and harmony between *a priori* and *a posteriori*, between reason and experience. Tr.

and the Father. "He that heareth you," said our Lord, "heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me." (Luke x. 16). The true Church, therefore, besides being One and Holy, must also be *Apostolic*. There were, indeed, twelve Apostles, but there can not be more than *One* universal Apostolic Church, because the Apostles themselves were a united body, an organic unity, charged to work in unison. They were at once the exemplary and the efficient cause, i.e. the representatives and the guardians of unity. Hence the many churches and different communions founded by them, while differing in time and space, formed but one great Church, i.e. the universal or *Catholic* Church, foretold by the prophets. From this it follows that the true Church must have these four qualities—it must be *Holy*, *One*, *Apostolic*, and *Catholic*.

3. In Holy Scripture all these properties or marks are attributed to the kingdom of God, which is the Christian Church. But the distinction is not always clearly drawn between individuals of the Church and the Church itself, nor again between these four qualities when viewed as mere properties, and when viewed as marks. And the same remark applies to the early Church. Thus S. Ignatius insists chiefly upon Catholicity, while Irenæus and Tertullian expound in detail the mark of Apostolicity; Sanctity found a champion in Origen; and Cyprian dwelt forcibly and at length upon the Unity of the Church.[1]

In his Dialogue against the Luciferians, S. Jerome comprises all the marks of the Church in Apostolicity and Catholicity. S. Augustine, in his reply to a Manichæan, gives his reasons for remaining in the Catholic Church. Apart from her pure doctrine, which but few adequately grasp, he enumerates the following points: the unity of peoples and nations; her authority, which was begun in miracles, fostered by hope, and mellowed by age; the succession of bishops from S. Peter, to

1 Ignat., *ad Smyrn.* c. 8. Iren., *adv. Haer.* III. 3, 24. Tertull., *de Praescript.* c. 20. Orig., *de Orat.* c. 20. Cypr., *de Unit Eccl.*

whom the Lord after His resurrection entrusted the feeding of His sheep, down to the present episcopate ; in fine, the name "Catholic," which, amid a multiplicity of heresies, this Church alone, not without reason, retains.[2] S. Vincent of Lerins mentions Catholicity, Antiquity, and Unity.[3]

4. From the words of the Nicene Creed, "I believe in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," the Church has always been considered to have four essential marks which contain all others. Later Theologians, when combating the doctrine of an invisible Church, broached by the Reformers, delighted in piling mark upon mark, and constructing a regular pyramid of marks. Naturally, they went too far, inasmuch as they introduced marks that were either unimportant or doubtful. Thus, for instance, Bellarmine, king of controversialists, enumerates some fourteen or fifteen, but observes that they are all contained in the four above-named. This is clear from a bare enumeration : the name "Catholic," antiquity, indefectibility, catholicity or universality, apostolicity, unity of doctrine, unity of constitution or government, efficacy of doctrine, the lives of the saints, the fame of miracles, the gift of prophecy, the confessions of opponents, the lot that has overtaken the persecutors of the Church, the temporal prosperity of her defenders.

5. The Vatican Council teaches : "That we may be able "to satisfy the obligation of embracing the true faith and "of constantly persevering in it, God has instituted the "Church through His only-begotten Son, and has bestowed "on it manifest notes of that institution, that it may be "recognized by all men as the guardian and teacher of "the revealed word ; for to the Church alone belong all "those many and admirable tokens which have been "divinely established for the evident credibility of the "Christian Faith. Nay, more, the Church, by itself, with "its marvellous extension, its eminent holiness, and its "inexhaustible fruitfulness in every good work, with its

2 *Contr. Epist. Fund.* c. 4. (Migne, XLII. 175).
3 *Commonit.* c. 3. For other divisions see Bellarmine, *Controv.* Tom. II. l. 11, 4, 3.

"Catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and "perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable wit- "ness of its own divine mission."[4]

6. Of the motives of credibility of Christianity we have already spoken.[5] They all bear witness to the Church, inasmuch as she has taught, propagated and preserved Christianity. And again, the special marks of the Church may be called motives of credibility, because they are clear, external signs whereby the true Church can be distinguished from the sects. Such outward marks are as necessary to the Church, as are the motives of credibility to Christianity. As our divine Lord considered it necessary, in addition to the proofs contained in His teaching, and in the grace that went forth from Him, to attest the credibility of His mission by such outward signs as miracles and prophecy, so He must also have left some outward marks by which the continuance of the work of the Incarnation in the Church could be recognized. Christ was, so to speak, compelled to provide them for His Church. How, otherwise, could men find irrefragable arguments for beliving in divine mysteries, or convincing motives for submitting their understandings to the obedience of faith? For without these it is impossible to believe.

7. From the words of the Vatican Council we cannot precisely determine what degree of credibility attaches to the marks of the Church. The credibility deduced from the proofs of Christianity is ranked as *evidence*; that is to say, those proofs make the truths of Christianity evidently credible. The evidence therefore refers naturally not to the contents but to the grounds of faith. In the same way, the marks of the Church do not make her doctrines evidently true, but invest them with an evident credibility which leads to faith, and gives it strength.

8. The four attributes are real *marks*, and not merely

4 *De Fide Catholica*, cap. 3. (Card. Manning's translation).

5 *Christian Apol.* vol. ii. chap. ix.

properties, of the Church. For not only do they belong to the very essence and nature of the Church, but they enter into the world of sense,—they are visible and evident to all who care to see, and to the thinking mind they are the external manifestation of the Spirit working within her. Were we asked to give some attributes of the Church as distinct from the marks, we should be inclined to name infallibility and indefectibility. But, in reality, they are bound up in such close dependence on apostolicity, unity and sanctity, that these must be regarded as their hidden spring and root. The same is true of the marks themselves, considered in their mutual bearing on one another. To separate them is difficult. This the reader must bear in mind. For in explaining the several marks, it would not be possible, except at the sacrifice of clearness, to avoid all repetition.

The first and most necessary mark is Apostolicity. For this is the only attribute that by itself furnishes and constitutes a complete guarantee that the Church was instituted by Jesus Christ. And since Jesus instituted but one Church, and that the Apostolic, the Church's oneness in space and time follows as a necessary consequence. Here, too, we see the link that joins Unity with Catholicity. Unity without Catholicity would not be a sure test; because unity within a narrow sphere would not be so remarkable a phenomenon as a unity stretching across many centuries, over the entire globe. Lastly, this Catholic and Apostolic Church must be Holy; because man's sanctification is the very end and purpose of Christianity. And this end must be realized by the Church and be, to some extent, visible in her life and action.

9. Sanctity forms the bond of union between the outward and the inward marks. It directly points to the deeper cause and reason of the Church's outward life, namely the living Spirit, who is the inward cause of her outer life and action. The Reformers, in making the internal marks consist in "the pure doctrine and the right administration of the sacraments"

were one-sided; for these, when severed from the external marks, dwindle down too far into the regions of subjectivity to be available as real marks. They might have taken a lesson from S. Augustine, who places the true doctrine after the external marks because, though a necessary attribute of the Church, it cannot be easily apprehended by all. Still, as a matter of course, the truth and grace of Christianity lends a powerful support to these motives. For the Vatican Council teaches that the Church's external "testi-"mony is efficaciously supported by a power from on high. "For our most merciful Lord gives His grace to stir up "and aid those who are astray, that they may come to a "knowledge of the truth; and to those whom He has "brought out of darkness into His own admirable light He "gives His grace to strengthen them to persevere in that "light, deserting none who desert not Him."[6]

6 *De fide Cath.* c. 3. (Card. Manning's translation).

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH APOSTOLIC.

I. THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE.

1. Jesus promised His disciples to be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world. Thus the continuous presence of the God-man in the Church also implies and presupposes the permanence of the Apostles whom He chose. As, in our Lord's life-time, they formed the main portion of the new community and the groundwork of the Church, so, after His departure from the earth, it was incumbent on them, with His assistance and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to propagate the Church He had founded, to preach His doctrine, and to inculcate obedience to His commandments. The Apostles were the witnesses of the life and resurrection of Jesus, His representatives in the Church, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God. And hence their office and their spirit must abide in every Church that purports to be the Church of Christ.

Jesus had constituted the Apostles the special witnesses of His resurrection. For although He appeared to the faithful, still it was the Apostles before all others whom he honoured with His presence, "for forty days appearing "to them and speaking of the kingdom of God." (Acts I. 2). He had promised to send the Paraclete, and so He "commanded them that they should not depart "from Jerusalem, but should wait for the promise of "the Father." (I. 4; Luke XXIV. 49). And He told them that they should receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon them, and that they should be His wit-

nesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and Samaria, and even "to the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts I. 8). When the time for electing some one to fill the place of the traitor Judas was at hand, Peter said: "Wherefore of these men who have "companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus came in "and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John "until the day wherein He was taken up from us, one of these "must be made a witness of His resurrection." (I. 21, 22). Thus they were perfectly qualified to be *human* witnesses. But this was not enough. Their testimony must needs have also a special divine sanction. It could not be the fleeting word of man, a mere babbling echo in a whirl of human opinions, but it must needs be a divine word, penetrating man's heart and, like a two-edged sword, cutting even to the division of the marrow and the bone. Its sound was to go forth to all the earth, and be heard by all nations. It was of necessity to be God's word, and to be capable of being recognized as such.

2. This divine sanction they received on the day of Pentecost. True, there appeared fiery tongues over all the faithful, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost. But as the Apostles had previously received a special rank, and S. Luke had just a little before introduced them as a special college (Acts I. 13 seq.), so the promised spirit of truth was imparted to them in an exceptional degree and manner. One and the same Spirit, indeed, descended on all the faithful, but upon each according to the measure of Christ, i.e. according to the position and office he had received. For the Spirit breatheth where He will, and gives to each one as He will. Who is it that at once stands up and makes known the power of the Holy Spirit? It is Peter, the first of the Apostles, who, on the very day on which the Holy Ghost set a seal on the Church, steps forward as Christ's witness, and receives three thousand converts into the Church. It is the Apostles who henceforward preach everywhere the word of God, communicate the Holy Spirit, and suffer reproach for the name of Jesus.

Nor could the Apostles have posed as public and official witnesses, whose testimony should command universal credence, unless Jesus Himself had authorized and empowered them so to act. And, indeed, as their name implies, they were chosen for this very purpose. An Apostle means an ambassador. Moreover, did not Jesus Himself previously send them on a trial mission? How much more necessary, then, was an authoritative mission after our Lord's death! This mission Christ repeatedly bestowed on them. First He promised it to Peter specially, and to all the Apostles conjointly: "Whatsoever you "shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and "whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in "heaven." (Matth. XVI. 19; XVIII. 18). But this judicial power cannot exist without a corresponding obedience on the part of the faithful. As Jesus identified Himself with the Father when He said that whosoever denied Him before men would be denied by Him before His heavenly Father, so, in a manner, He identifies His Apostles with Himself, and declares that He will consider as done to Himself all that is done to them: "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that "receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me." (Matth. x. 40). "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, "despiseth me. And He that despiseth me, despiseth Him "that sent me." (Luke x. 16).

3. Now these promises, at once definite and general, were formally ratified by Jesus after His resurrection. "When the "doors were shut where the disciples were gathered together" the risen Saviour stood in the midst of them and said: "Peace "be to you. As the Father hath sent me I also send you. "When He had said this He breathed on them, and He said "to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall "forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall "retain they are retained." (John xx. 21-23). Just before His ascension He took His Apostles out to Galilee,—the scene of the greater part of His public life, where He had made

disciples,—and there gave them power over the whole world. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going "therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of "the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching "them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matth. xxviii. 18-20). What Jesus had received from the Father, that He communicated to the Apostles. They held office among men as teachers, priests and leaders of the Church; they are Christ's vicegerents. To them, as ambassadors of the Father, the faithful owe the same obedience as to the Father Himself.

The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles thoroughly bear out this view of the official position which the Apostles held, both in local Churches and in the universal Church. In all matters that further or impede the progress of the Church in its infancy, the Apostles not only play the chief part, but they do so ostensibly as accredited plenipotentiaries of Christ, armed with the power of the Holy Spirit. Peter and John warn the Sanhedrin that they must obey God rather than men. Ananias laid part of the price of the land "at the feet of the Apostles." Peter tells him that he has lied not to men but to God, and then he inflicted a "terrible chastisement on this first revolt against "Apostolic authority and the Spirit who rules over the Church." When a murmuring arose amongst the Greeks against the Hebrews, the Twelve called together the multitude of disciples and said: "It is not reason that we should leave the word of "God and serve tables." (vi. 2). During the persecution the Apostles stayed behind in Jerusalem. But when they "heard "that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto "them Peter and John who, when they were come, prayed over "them that they might receive the Holy Ghost." (viii. 14. 15). When Saul, after his conversion, had returned to Jerusalem, "Barnabas took him and brought him to the Apostles, and "told them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that He "had spoken to him, and how in Damascus he had dealt

"confidently in the name of Jesus." (IX. 27). The reception of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, into the Church was undertaken by Peter in consequence of a special revelation.

At the Apostolic Council, the "Apostles and ancients" assembled to consider this matter. (XV. 6). The decree, drawn up by the "Apostles and ancients with the whole Church" (v. 22), is represented as the work of the Holy Spirit and of those assembled. (v. 28). They write a letter to the brethren: "The Apostles and ancients brethren, to the brethren of the "Gentiles that are at Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia, greeting." Ordinary translations, indeed, read "The Apostles and ancients *and the* brethren," but the five oldest codices, the Armenian version, the Vulgate and many Fathers omit the italicised words. Moreover our reading, being the more difficult, must be preferred, as in the Acts "the brethren" generally mean the faithful. The words were omitted "for hierarchical reasons," naïvely observes Meyer on the passage, and many Protestant writers are enthusiastic in adopting his view. But what has he to offer in proof? The most modern textual critics, such as Lachmann, Buttmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Hort, and Westcott, who certainly cannot be suspected of hierarchical leanings, have adopted the reading that omits "*and the*." To argue that the "*brethren*"—to which the same word immediately following no doubt here gave rise—cannot possibly be used in this sense, is to take up an untenable position, as the word, in the singular at all events, is repeatedly used to designate a brother in the ministry.[1] The parallel passage in v. 22 tells more against than in favour of the other reading; for, even there, the community is not put on a equal footing with the "Apostles and ancients."

The work of evangelizing Palestine and the Roman Empire was carried out under the direction of the Apostles, with Jerusalem as their head-quarters. The Apostles were Apostles before the particular community which we are accustomed to call the church of Jerusalem, or indeed any one of the parti-

1 I Cor. i. 1. II Cor. i. 1; ii: 13. Ephes. vi. 21. Col. i. 1.

cular churches scattered up and down the country, was founded. Properly speaking, the Church begins with the Apostles. They are the first Church, the mother Church in Jerusalem, that in course of time gave birth to the others. Thus the whole Church is not to be regarded as a mere aggregate of churches, but as the expansion and development of that Church founded by Christ, which, as He had promised, was to be diffused by the Apostles under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They were one and all daughters of the mother Church which contained in germ the universal Church. But they were organically connected. They were a genuine growth out of the first Church. And the organic bond that linked all particular churches was precisely the Apostolate. Round this the whole Church revolved as a centre. The Apostles did not confine their pastoral care to the church in Jerusalem, but watched over other churches as well. Nay, the more the Church spread by their preaching, the less conspicuous they became in Jerusalem. They disappear from the local church, and in a certain sense, even from the scene of history. For the author of the Acts had neither the intention nor the power to write a history of all the Apostles. His gaze was narrowed to the first period in which Saul persecuted the Church, and to the subsequent period in which the figure of Paul towers above all others.

4. Does it thence follow that Christ instituted the Apostolate merely as a preaching ministry, and not as an office in the Church?[a] Did the choice of the Twelve mean that they were called to be teachers and nothing more? Or did it at the same time show forth the destiny of the new Israel, which is elsewhere reflected in the saying, that they shall sit in judgment on the twelve tribes? (Matth. XIX. 28). Hardly any one who has read with attention the passages we have quoted, in which Jesus invested His Apostles with the power given Him by His

[a] Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter, p. 606.* Beyschlag, in Riehm's *Bibl. Handwörterbuch*, i. 72.

Father, can doubt that He bestowed on them office and dignity. From the *Acts*, too, we see that the Apostles were something over and above preachers and teachers.* It is true, indeed, that the office of Apostle was not confined to one church or community. But does the office perchance thereby lose its character? Assuredly it was precisely in founding, arranging and managing new churches, that the Apostles exercised their office and authority. S. Peter's visits to the churches in Judæa, recorded in the Acts, the letters and verbal communications which frequently passed between S. Paul and the churches he had newly founded, bespeak official guidance and supervision which lasted until those whom the Apostles had set over the churches, were in a position to act more or less independently.

5. But, it is urged, the Apostles can in no way be regarded as one corporation; they were only so many individual units. For this reason, it is further urged, it is only individuals, like Peter and John, that come to the front, and appear invested with power and authority. But this theory is clearly confuted both by the text and words of the New Testament, and by the whole analogy with the Old Testament. As ancient Israel formed one people, one great synagogue, so the judges who sit on twelve thrones form a bench or college, who pass judgment in common. The Twelve, then, in virtue of that judicial office, which, from many passages, has been demon-

* In order to understand what the author means by mere preachers and teachers, it is necessary to bear in mind that there may be two kinds of teachers. All real genuine teachers must of course have a certain authority and power to teach. But this power and authority may arise from different sources. One teacher's authority is entirely due to his knowledge and capacity. His authority begins and ends with his competency. He has no other voucher for the truth of his teaching except his own ability to form a judgment. Other teachers there are, who, besides having competent knowledge, are appointed to the office by one who has the right to make the appointment. Such an authoritative appointment gives him an authority quite distinct from that derived from his own knowledge and competency. He is an authoritative, an authentic teacher, in the strictest sense of the term. By mere preachers and teachers, therefore, the author denotes the former, not the latter. In no case could the Apostles be called mere preachers and teachers. For, even if they had not been endowed with authority to rule and judge in the Church, they would still have been authoritative and authentic teachers. Tr.

strated to belong to them, exercise, in the new Israel, a power that far transcends mere teaching. And this power was given to them both personally, and in their corporate capacity. And although the want of actual contact brought about by their subsequent dispersion seemed for a time, or even for ever, to break the bonds that bound them with one another, still, in reality, each one felt himself impelled by the same apostolic spirit, and was sensibly conscious that he was a member of the one corporate body.

Even S. Paul, whose vocation was effected in a most extraordinary manner, neither had the power nor the wish to exempt himself from the divine ordinance. In going to Jerusalem to *know* Cephas, he had no other end in view than to establish his connection with the head of the Apostles and the Primitive Church. When he adds that he saw no other Apostle but Peter, excepting James, the brother of the Lord, his purpose is to show that he too was a real Apostle, and that his gospel was obtained immediately by divine revelation, and not from any instructions he had received from the other Apostles. Nor was this in any way a reflection on the other Apostles. For, surely, it will not be argued that Peter had no connection with them. When Paul again visited Jerusalem he mentions no one but James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, but this only confirms the explanation we have given already. (Gal. II. 9). He communicated with the Apostles present "who seemed to be something." Why should any other reason be assigned than that given by the Apostle himself? He communicated to them the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, lest perhaps he "should run or had run in vain"; and he arrived at this understanding with them,—that to him and his helpmates was committed the gospel of uncircumcision (Gentiles), and to them that of circumcision (Jews). Thus the Apostles appear neither as mere teachers without office, nor as stray individuals disjointed from a community, but as ministers equipped with authority and power, and commissioned, each

and all, to carry on, as a body, the Redeemer's work. They meet together, and issue, in a joint note, such ordinances as seem necessary for the propagation of the gospel and the welfare of the Church. These are the "pillars" on which the Church rests.

6. But, may it not be said, that perchance, a "few among them gradually obtained notoriety thus," and acquired some semblance of authority? But, first, we would ask in turn, why, under such circumstances, should S. Paul, the chosen vessel of election to the heathen, feel himself bound to lay his gospel before them? Secondly, even so, they would have won their commanding position, simply and solely, because they were Apostles of the Lord; it would still be based on their office and dignity. Thirdly, we learn from the Synoptists, that Christ Himself began to give the preference to one or two. Peter, James and John always stand out prominently.[3] Paul's visit is set down by Weizsäcker to the year 38. If that be so, then Peter's authority must have risen with incredible rapidity. On his visit in 52 A D., he met those who were considered "three pillars" in the Church. But does this circumstance warrant us in concluding that the circle of eminent Apostles was contracting, and that there were only a few of any importance left, and they not by reason of their office, but on account of their personal influence and position?

The Apostle of the Gentiles himself refutes this theory of gradual development of the apostolic authority, when he elsewhere compares his apostolate with that of the Twelve or rather the Eleven. And he does so at an early stage. Speaking of the appearances of the risen Saviour, he classifies them into two distinct groups: those to Cephas and the Eleven, to James and all the other Apostles. He appeals to the example of "the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and "Cephas" to prove his right to live by the gospel. Far from casting doubts on the rights and power, the authority and

3 Matth. xvii. 1; xxvi. 37. Mark v. 37.

dignity of the first Apostles, he strives to show, although he had not known Christ in the flesh, that he stood on an equal footing with them. With dignified emphasis and holy zeal he proclaims himself to be "Paul, an Apostle, not of men, nor by "men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised "Him up from the dead." (Galat. I. 1). But to the *first* Apostles our Lord had said: "As the Father hath sent me, I "also send you."

Like the first Apostles he claims that his *divine mission* should be recognized. "For Christ therefore we are ambassa-"dors, God as it were exhorting by us." (II Cor. V. 20). He regards himself, and his companions and fellow-workers as "the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of "God." (I Cor. IV. 1). As Christ's envoy, he had planted the Church in Corinth, which was a "letter of Christ" ministered by him, and written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God. "Such confidence we have, through Christ "towards God. Not that we are sufficient to think anything "of ourselves, as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God, "who also hath made us fit ministers of the New Testament." (II Cor. III. 4-6). And this ministry of the Spirit is far nobler than the ministry of the letter. "Therefore seeing we have "this ministration, according as we have obtained mercy, we "faint not." (II Cor. IV. 1). And if the Jewish Priest was not allowed to take the honour to himself (Hebr. V. 4) should the Christian Priest? Nor is the passage from Ephesians IV. 11 an instance to the contrary, because it is admitted that he is here enumerating the offices according to I Cor. XII. 28.[4]

7. But, it is objected, the Apostle speaks in the plural, and therefore he includes his helpers in the ministry with himself. Them also he calls Apostles. Did he then confer on them the name as well as the office and the dignity? And if so, how can the apostolate be a specific office? Paul, indeed, calls Timothy and Silvanus, who accompanied him on his second

4 Weizsäcker, p. 640.

missionary journey, Apostles. (I Thess. II. 7). In the address he couples his companions' names with his own, but he does not thereby give them the same rank as himself. The whole tenour of the letter contradicts this view. The same is the case with I Cor. VI. 9, where the Apostle and Apollo are grouped together. For Apollo is a fellow-labourer in the Lord's vineyard, having preached the gospel in Corinth. But he elsewhere insists so strongly on the special vocation *he* had received, that the idea of him supposing that the vocation of his companions was tantamount to his own, or that they were the equals of the first Apostles is not to be entertained. Still less can there be a question of equality in Romans XVI. 7, although S. Paul appears to number Andronicus and Junias with the Apostles, and testifies that they bear an illustrious name. The passage runs thus: "Salute Andronicus and Junias as my "kinsmen and fellow prisoners, who are of note among "the Apostles." The word "among" (ἐν) should, very probably, be rendered "with" *(apud)*. And with all the more reason, "because the word ἀπόστολος, in the wider sense, is only "once (I Cor. XV. 7) used of Paul (see Acts XIV. 4.14); and "yet even here it is used strictly enough to take in James and "the Twelve," as even Meyer remarks on this passage. In like manner Peter had previously named himself *with* the Eleven (see Mark XVI. 7).

Thus, throughout the whole range of the Pauline Epistles, there is not a single passage in which any one of the Apostle's companions is called an Apostle apart from the others. For II Cor. VIII. 23 can hardly be alleged in counterproof, as it treats of envoys of the Churches, not of Christ. The same must be said of Phil. II. 25. There only remains the passage in the Acts already referred to: "which when the Apostles Barnabas and "Paul had heard, &c." (Acts XIV. 14). Barnabas is honoured, both in the Greek and the Western Church, as an Apostle. Still it is clear that he was only in a secondary sense an Apostle, as he was not immediately called by Christ. In the

first place, it is to be noticed that Barnabas is here only mentioned in conjunction with the Apostle Paul, and this circumstance also explains why he is first named, because, forsooth, he it was who had introduced the converted Saul to the Apostles. (Acts IX. 27.) In the next place, the reason why no special distinction is made between them as Apostles, may be manifold. Paul himself is not called an Apostle before his ordination and his first missionary journey. The name "Paul" is given to him for the first time only in chap. XIII. 9. In subsequent passages this title is not given to him either alone or with others. And, if he had been called an Apostle because Barnabas was an Apostle, then the title would appear regularly whenever they are mentioned together, which is not the case.[5] Thus XIV. 14 is an exceptional case, and the special reason is perhaps to be sought in the fact that both were exposed to the danger of having idolatrous worship paid to them.*

The first Epistle to the Corinthians is also urged in proof that Barnabas was an Apostle in the full and proper sense.[6] S. Paul, speaking in the plural, claims the same privileges as the other Apostles, and then continues thus: "Or I "only and Barnabas, have not we the power to do this?" But both before and after he uses the singular: "Am not "I free? Am not I an Apostle? Have not I seen Jesus "Christ? Are not you my work in the Lord? And if "unto others I be not an Apostle, but yet to you I am. "I have used none of these things." It is clear, therefore, that Barnabas is ranked and named among the Apostles because of his share in the missionary journeys, labours and sufferings of S. Paul. But the decisive test, vocation and mission by Christ, the Apostle reserves exclusively to himself.

5 Acts xiii. 43. 46. 50; xv. 2. 35.

6 I Cor. ix. 5. 6. See Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 57.

* This explanation is somewhat obscure, and so far as it is intelligible, it does not seem to meet the difficulty. For also in xiv. 4 both are called Apostles; and the author has admitted above that the word is here taken in a wider sense. [Tr.]

Some, again, have thought that it may be proved from Paul's Epistles that when he came on the scene, he found the custom of giving to others besides the Twelve the name Apostle already established, and that he was induced by his later vocation to extend the title still further in favour of his own authority. But there is no foundation whatever for such a theory. The passage in I Cor. xv. 7 has already been noticed. There the Twelve are included, and therefore the conclusion that it was extended to others is lame. Gal I. 19 would be convincing only in the supposition that James, the brother of the Lord, could not be likewise an Apostle. Now the two are very probably identical. Nor is this view weakened by I Cor. IX. 5, where the brethren of the Lord are named after the Apostles; for the separate mention of the "brethren no more excludes them "from the Apostolate than it does Peter, who is specially "mentioned."[7] On the contrary, this passage tells in favour of the sense in which we understand the Apostolate. The point which S. Paul wishes to urge, is that he can claim the same privileges as the other Apostles, because he is an Apostle like the others, even though some be brethren of the Lord. This line of argument was calculated to bring out his true Apostolic dignity to the full.

Still more surprising is it to see how others argue from Gal. I. I that there must have been Apostles appointed of men and by men. The passage implies the very opposite. For the Apostle is defending himself against the taunt that, not having been appointed in our Lord's lifetime, he was an Apostle of man and not entitled to be ranked as a genuine Apostle. Had he known any, who had been made real Apostles by men, he would not have needed to go so far as to claim equal rank with the first Apostles, in order to prove his own claim to the Apostolate. This even Weizsäcker concedes at the outset. "The "Twelve," he says, "remain what they are, but the name "Apostle was also given to others who were called to be

7 Weizsäcker, pp. 608-610.

"missioners." "It cannot be said that Paul bases his own "Apostolic rights on the custom of admitting others to the "Apostolate." "Essentially the Apostolate was unchanged. ". . . without Apostles there was no Church; all other "offices were grafted on this."

8. This view receives further confirmation from the conditions that S. Paul requires in one who aspires to the Apostolate. He must be of Jewish descent (II Cor. XI. 22); he must have seen the Lord (I Cor. IX. 1; II Cor. V. 16); he must be a servant of Christ (II Cor. XI. 23); he must prove himself by working signs and wonders and mighty deeds (II Cor. XII. 12); and he must steadfastly suffer persecution for Christ's sake (XI. 23 seq.) Strange to say, this has been held to prove the contrary view. For these conditions, it is argued, would be utterly meaningless, if the number of Apostles had been fixed at the outset, and limited to a mere handful. Such a line of argument, however, rests upon a misunderstanding of the whole drift of S. Paul in the second Epistle to the Corinthians. He is there comparing his Apostolate with that of the first Apostles, in order to justify his right, in the teeth of slanderers, to be called an Apostle. He compares himself with the other Apostles. He will be foolish, and recount his labours and persecutions, his visions and revelations, his success, because his adversaries had branded him a spurious Apostle. But he does not give the slightest intimation that he is there setting forth the conditions of the Apostolate in general. His leading idea is: "I think that I am nothing less than the "great Apostles."[8] What they were and what the gifts they had received we learn from the Acts and the Gospels.[9] True, he uses hard words against his adversaries, calling them apostles of lying, traitors having the mask of Apostles, servants of Satan. Now it would be preposterous to suppose that he has here in view the first Apostles. But is it equally impossible that he is

8 II Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11. See I Cor. xv. 10.

9 Mark xvi. 20. Acts ii. 43; v. 12.

hitting out at men who had usurped their position? From the very fact that (XI. 5) he mentions the genuine Apostles, he cannot have recognized the apostles of lying as apostles in any shape or form. They quoted the first Apostles as having these preliminary qualifications in order to browbeat Paul. The Epistles of commendation (III. 1) prove nothing, as both their contents and their author are unknown. S. Paul's appeal to his own living commendatory letter does not proceed from the recognition of their Apostolate, but shifts the ground of controversy from the commendatory letters; that is to say, no such letters would avail for attacking his own Apostolate.

The *Apostolate*, then, is not mere missionary enterprise or duty, nor the outcome of "historical development." Rather is it a positive and peculiar institution of Christ, for carrying on His threefold office. No apostle, in the strict sense, but received an immediate mandate from Christ. Had the dignity of an Apostle depended solely on a Church having received the faith from him, it was surely labour lost on Paul's part to prove that he had equal rights with the first Apostles, from the fact that the Lord had appeared to him. As Christ was the point in which their preaching centred, so none but Christ's delegates could fully vouch for the truth of faith. The relation in which they stood to Christ was the measure of their authority and claim to obedience. It was this that made Peter, James, and John "pillars," even in the eyes of those who had not received the faith from them. Their authority and rank existed before the community, and was independent of it. Of course this would not prevent individuals from acquiring a special personal authority in churches in which they had erected their sees, as for instance, James in Jerusalem (who was much respected by the Jews), Peter in Antioch and Rome, Paul in his many churches. But the *raison d'être* of their authority lay not in their personal influence, but in their Apostolate.

9. Naturally, in the *exercise* of their office, the Apostles acted quite differently from worldly magistrates and heathen

princes. We should not have thought it necessary to touch on this point, had it not been twisted into an argument against the Apostolate. How, it is asked, could the spirit of self-denial and humility tolerate a domineering and despotic rule in the Apostolic Church? Did not Christ enjoin His disciples to be simple as children? Nay, did He not forbid them to bear the name masters, and to lord it like the heathen? "Be not you called Rabbi. For one "is your master, and all you are brethren." (Matth. xxiii. 8.) Weizsäcker, for instance, draws the following conclusion from this passage: "The emphasis with which "this commandment was given proves clearly that, in the "beginning, at all events, it was observed. Consequently, "all that received the word, became purely and simply dis-"ciples of Jesus. At the same time it asserted the princi-"ple of equality, and thereby made all feel that their society "was not the same as a school of pupils learning the law. "Moreover, it was not so much their business to interpret "laws, as to excite faith in Jesus as the Christ, and in His "kingdom; and thus the public authority, proper to a "school, was quite excluded in their case. By outsiders, "however, they (the Apostles?) might perhaps be consid-"ered an αἵρεσις."[10]

Is it really possible, we ask, to give so wide a bearing to this most simple command? Does the Christian community lack authority and organization simply because it is not a Rabbinical school? If ever conclusion was wider than the premisses, it is this. For the rest we must look at the prohibitory command of our Lord in the light of the anti-pharisaical character of the whole discourse in which it occurs, and even there our Lord plainly draws a distinction between person and office. "The Scribes and "the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All "things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, ob-"serve and do; but according to their works do ye "not; for they say and do not." (Matth. xxiii. 23.) So

10 Weizsäcker, p. 37. Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit* i. p. 25.

when Jesus lashes ambition, and warns His disciples not to love titles, He does not trample on office, but on the vanity and vain-glory that takes pleasure in outward pomp and splendour. This is clear also from the context. "And "call none your Father upon earth, for one is your Father "who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters, for one "is your master, Christ. He that is the greatest among "you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt "himself shall be humbled, and he that shall humble him-"self shall be exalted." (Matth. XXIII. 9-12). Is, perchance, the title of Father forbidden? Must we conclude that we have no Father on earth?[11] One thing follows, and only one. The Father in heaven is the true Father, from whom all earthly paternity proceeds. Christ is the one master, the way, the truth, and the life. He therefore who assumes these titles without full authority from Christ and God is guilty of pharisaical presumption.[12] But he whom Christ has installed in office, will discharge it for Christ, and not baptize in the name of Cephas, Paul, or Apollo. As regards the equality of the brethren the argument is a blank.

The same reply holds good for the warning against the despotic exercise of authority. "The kings of the Gentiles "lord it over them, and they that have power over them "are called beneficent. But you not so; but he that is the "greater among you, let him become as the younger, and "he that is leader, as he that serveth." (Luke XXII. 25, 26). Why would Jesus have used this illustration at all, unless he had actually constituted some as leaders, and placed them in authority? He sets Himself before their eyes as their model, not by resigning His office, but by teaching them to exercise it with humility. He adds: "And I dispose to you, as my Father hath disposed "to me a kingdom: that you may eat and drink at my "table in my kingdom, and may sit upon thrones judg-"ing the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke XXII. 29. 30).

11 Aug. *de fide et symb.* c. 4, 9.
12 Gregor. M. *Ep.* v. 18. See also Döllinger, l. c. p. 34, 233.

On this passage S. Peter supplies a commentary: "The "ancients therefore that are among you, I beseech who "am myself also an ancient and a witness of the sufferings "of Christ, as also a partaker of that glory which is to be "revealed in time to come; Feed the flock which is among "you, taking care of it not by constraint, but willingly "according to God; not for filthy lucre's sake, but volun-"tarily; neither as lording it over the clergy, but being "made a pattern of the flock from the heart." (I Pet. v. 1–3.) What then is forbidden is not office, but a domineering spirit; not rights and authority, but a despotic abuse of authority.

If this distinction between the christian and the worldly exercise of authority be kept steadily in view, there will be no temptation to argue that the Apostles, by adopting a kindly and brotherly tone towards the faithful, were unconscious that they held any official position. In point of fact, the Apostles could show a strong wrist, when necessary. They made their teaching and their command respected. We learn from the Acts that the faithful were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles (II. 42); and great stress is laid on this in S. Paul's Epistles,[13] as the Epistle to the Galatians, from first to last, bears witness. Even in the Epistle to the Romans, which was addressed to a church to which he was a stranger, he exacts the same respect for his words. By Jesus Christ "we have received "grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith in all "nations for His name." (I. 5.) "For I dare not to "speak of any of those things which Christ worketh not "by me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and "deed; by the virtue of signs and wonders, in the power "of the Holy Ghost." (xv. 18 seq.)

10. Sometimes the Apostles entreated the whole community to co-operate with them. This fact has been pounced upon as supplying material for another objection. But, in

13 II Thess. ii. 15. Rom. vi. 17; xvi. 17. I Cor. iv. 17–21; xiv. 38. II Cor. xiii. 2 seq.

reality, it is only one more proof of the organic connection between the Apostles and the faithful, and at the same time a mark of great pastoral wisdom. Like the Apostles at Jerusalem, when grave issues were at stake, S. Paul secured the co-operation of the whole community of Corinth. With the full consciousness of his apostolic authority he commands the Corinthians to cast out of their midst the incestuous adulterer. Absent, indeed, in body, but present in spirit, he had already judged the man, as though he were present. Still he wishes them, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, "being gathered together, and my "spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to de-"liver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, "that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus "Christ." (I. Cor. v. 1. seq.) In like manner, after the man had repented, the Apostle ordered the Corinthians to receive him back into the Church lest he should fall a prey to despair and perish. In the same light we must view other similar orders given by him, to visit scandalous public sinners with public censure, or to hand over to Satan the recalcitrant.[14]

But, it is argued, in the case of the prohibition to dissolve the marriage bond, S. Paul traces it in so many words to our Lord's command (I Cor. VII. 10), and with regard to virginity, he draws a distinction between his counsel and the Lord's command. (VII. 25.) This, however, only proves that the Apostle was a dispenser of the mysteries of God; that the teaching and commandment of the Lord were his unalterable standard; but it in no way goes to show that he neither had nor claimed the right (XIV. 37) to issue commands of his own. Giving counsel would strip his orders of all binding force, only in the supposition that he never gave anything else but counsel. But this is not the case. Nay, just as there are only two instances in which he, in set terms, quotes the Lord's commands (VII. 10; IV. 14), so he only once uses the word "counsel"

14 II Thess. iii. 6. 15. 15. I Tim. i. 20. II Tim. iii. 5. II John x. 10. 11. See Döllinger, p. 347.

(συγγνώμη VII. 6; but γνωμη VII. 25. 40; II Cor. VIII. 10). Further on he gives orders concerning the collections (XVI. 1), directions regarding divine worship, the gifts of the Spirit, the flesh offered to idols, and he distinctly says that he will regulate other matters when he comes. He appeals to his teaching in other churches (VII. 17). He bids the Thessalonians, as he had bidden the Corinthians (XI. 2) to hold fast to the traditions (II Thess. II. 15). He strenuously protests against any change being made in his Gospel.[15]

What does II. Cor. I. 24 prove against this? "Not because "we exercise dominion over your faith, but we are helpers of "your joy; for in faith you stand." What do other similar passages prove? "For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus "Christ our Lord, and ourselves your servants through Jesus." "I speak not as commanding, but by the carefulness of others, "approving also the good disposition of your charity." (VIII. 8). For does he not say in the same Epistle: "For to this end "also did I write, that I may know the experiment of you, "whether you be obedient in all things." (II. 9). Do not the words in I Cor. IV. 21 sound like those of an Apostle having power? "What will you? Shall I come to you with a rod, or "in charity, and the spirit of meekness"? In II Cor. X. 4-6 he says: "Destroying counsels, and every height that exalteth "itself against the knowledge of God . . . . and having "in readiness to revenge all disobedience." And at the conclusion of his severe letter to the Corinthians he clearly states his position in these words: "Therefore I write these "things being absent, that, being present, I may not deal more "severely, according to the power which the Lord hath given "me unto edification, and not unto destruction" (II Cor. XIII. 10). The Apostles, it is true, do "not issue oracular and "peremptory decrees, but rather remind and persuade the "faithful; they do not set their words on an equal footing with "those of the Lord, but distinctly subordinate them (I Cor.

15 Rom. xvi. 17. II Cor. xi. 4. Gal. i. 1 seq. Phil. i. 27. Col. ii. 7.

"vii. 10, 25, 40)";[16] but does it therefore follow that the servants of Christ (I Cor. iv. 1; I Pet. v. 1) have no authority in the Churches? Again, neither the institution of the diaconate, which, after all, was not contrary to the wishes of the Apostles (Acts vi. 1 seq), nor the gifts of grace given for special functions in the Church (I Cor. xii.), rob the Apostolate, nor even the offices instituted by the Apostles, of their official authority. How forcibly S. Paul asserted his authority is clear from the foregoing texts which cumulatively amount to a "decree." S. Paul has two sides to his character; the one is visible when he seeks to entwine himself round tender hearts, the other when he strives to terrify evil doers. In some Epistles the two sides alternate: "The one seems to "ebb and flow with the feelings, views and circumstances of "his comrades in the faith; the other, in which, standing on "his apostolic dignity, he entreats, reproves and rebukes."[17] The Apostles had to deal with neophytes, with people whose lives were spent amidst heathens steeped in sin, and who needed charity and consideration, lest their flickering light should be extinguished, or the bruised reed be broken. "But "on two points, far from showing weakness, they formulated "their demands with precision: the duty of confessing Christ, "and of entering into no compromise with heretics."

Much, then, as S. Paul condescends to the opinions and wishes of the faithful, he is as convinced that his Apostolic authority is derived immediately from God, as that he is not acting as a "delegate of the Church." How could he have written a letter to the Romans, as a delegate of their Church? The wonderful gifts of the Spirit that manifested themselves in the Apostolic Churches, enabled even the laity to take an active part in teaching, and in the service of God and the Church,[18] and thus to realize the promised universal priesthood. But

16 Beyschlag, p. 74. Langen, p. 23.
17 Döllinger, l. c. p. 90, 235.
18 See Rom. xii. I Cor. xii. I Thess. v. 19 seq. Jam. iii. 1.

this general dignity and common duty detracted as little from the special authority of the Apostles in the Churches as the descent of the Holy Ghost on all the disciples absorbed the special communication that had already been given to the Apostles when receiving their office (John xx. 23). Of "hier-"archical absolutism" there is none, indeed, in the early Church, but the Apostolic office is hierarchical, though it be exercised in humility and meekness.

11. Nor, again, is it accurate to say that the teaching office of the Apostles lasted only until the faithful had been completely schooled in Christian doctrine; as if the Apostles had posed as teachers to none but heathens and Jews, and those whose instruction was imperfect. Were there then no more teachers required among the faithful who had been fully instructed? Were they all perfect? But the Apostle says distinctly: "Howbeit we speak wisdom among the perfect, yet "not the wisdom of this world . . but the wisdom of God "in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden. . . . But to us "God hath revealed it by His Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all "things, yea even the deep things of God." (I Cor. II. 6 seq.) "Strong meat is for the perfect." (Hebr. v. 14). The Apostle's activity in writing Epistles is a standing proof that the teaching office of the Apostles was bounded by no limits as to time or condition, and that it could never become superfluous. Like most errors, this theory contains just one grain of truth, namely, that revelation closed, and the deposit of faith was completed with the teaching of the Apostles, and that the whole was entrusted to the guardianship of the Church, to serve, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as a source from which the faithful were, in all ages to draw the living waters of truth.

S. Paul, too, frequently refers to the offices that God had instituted in the Church, and regularly assigns the first place to the Apostolic office. After comparing the Church with the body and its members, he says: "And God indeed hath set "some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly

"doctors." (I Cor. XII. 28). Nor may we limit the application of this passage to the Church in Corinth, for its whole drift forbids this restriction. The only Apostles in Corinth to which it could refer would be Paul and Cephas, and they were not set over Corinth. The parallel texts also demand its application to the whole Church.[19] And the order of enumeration, too, agrees with what the Apostle relates generally about the gifts of the Spirit in Corinth. As he himself was conscious of possessing them, so he ascribed to the Apostles first-named the fulness of the Spirit. Being Apostles they are at the same time prophets, and have the grace of healing and the gift of tongues, and so forth. Hence it is bad logic to say that S. Paul viewed the Apostles, not as bearers of the Apostolic office, but only as men endowed with the *charismata*.[20] Nor, again, does it follow that the prophets here mentioned were merely persons endowed with the charismata, who had no regular office in the ecclesiastical organism as such. For while S. Paul, in treating of the charismata, simply mentions the Apostles as the well-known authorities, he explains the charisma of prophecy as something less known in the Church. These prophets were members of the Church, who had received a special gift of the Spirit to speak on the doctrines of revelation, and thereby to strengthen the faith of the new community.[21] The essential difference between the two can be gleaned from our Lord's discourse: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall "receive the reward of a prophet. And he that receiveth a just "man in the name of a just man shall receive the reward of a "just man." (Matth. x. 40). But of the Apostles Jesus says: "He that receiveth you receiveth me."[22] (v. 40). The Apostles are Christ's vicars, and the prophetic Spirit guides them in their official capacity as teachers and rulers.

19 Ephes. i. 22; iv. 11. Phil. iii. 6.

20 Döllinger, p. 297.

21 I Cor. xiv. 3. 24. 25. Ephes. iii. 5. I Thess. v. 20. Rom. xii. 6.

22 See Apoc. xviii. 20. 24; xxii. 9. Acts xi. 28; xxi. 10; xiii. 1; xv. 32.

From this we may understand, why Apostles and prophets are placed in juxtaposition in Ephes. II. 20 and III. 5; and why there is no need to have recourse here to the Old Testament prophets. In IV. 11, it is true, others, namely evangelists, pastors and teachers are mentioned in addition to Apostles and prophets. But this is clearly a subdivision rather than a fresh list of distinct offices. Some might have shared in one or other of the manifold works of the Apostolate without being Apostles, or without the Apostles ceasing to do the same work. In the *Teaching of the Apostles* (Didache) prophets and doctors, as well as Apostles and prophets, are set forth as models for Bishops and Deacons (II. 3). Here, indeed, a wider meaning is given to the name "Apostle," and the passage in Matthew is quoted as a precedent. But the author is far from intending to assign the same office to them as to the first Apostles, for he could not have said of these that people should look upon them as prophets of lying, if they tarry three days. Still this wider acceptation of the term is unusual in the older literature. Thus, Clement of Rome calls Apollo, as distinct from the Apostles, a man approved by them.[23] The larger signification is first found in Clement of Alexandria and Origen.[24] Still it does not, in their writings, obscure the distinction between the two kinds of Apostles.

Who are the "teachers" or "doctors" mentioned by S. Paul? What was their relation to the Apostles and the Apostolate? We learn from S. Paul that they were those who, by a special charisma of the Holy Ghost, were qualified to fulfil the office of teaching before the assembled Church, according as the Spirit moved them. Still they are subordinate and auxiliary teachers, and cannot be compared with the Apostles, who were the first and chief teachers of their Churches.[25] S. Paul alludes to the "ways which are in Christ Jesus, as I teach

23 *Ad Corinth.* I. 47.

24 See Funk, *Doctrina Apostolor.* Tubingae 1887, p. 32.

25 I Cor. xiv. 6. Acts xiii. 1.

"everywhere in every Church." (I Cor. IV. 17). He speaks of "that form of doctrine" (Rom. VI. 17) which he had delivered to them. (II Thessal. II. 15). To this doctrine, which none can preach unless they are sent (Rom. X. 14), the faithful must hold fast. (Rom. XVI. 17). "If you have ten "thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many Fathers. For "in Christ Jesus by the Gospel I have begotten you." (I Cor. IV. 15).

In these words the Apostle has described the distinguishing mark between the Apostolic and the subordinate office of teaching. The Apostles are the dispensers of the mysteries of God, and they tend the ministry of reconciliation. (II Cor. V. 18). By comparing this ministry with Christ's sacrifice of reconciliation, S. Paul shows that the word of reconciliation, given to the Apostles, is the outcome of their mission. Though they entreat and beseech the people for the sake of Christ, "Be reconciled with God," they do so as Christ's envoys, as ministers and mediators of reconciliation, who can "beget" the faithful by the Gospel. Nowhere is it said that the mere reception of the word will effect this reconciliation, otherwise the baptism of regeneration would no longer be necessary. The Apostles were *the* dispensers of truth and grace in the Church. The case is so clear that it hardly needs further explanation. In conclusion we will let a Protestant writer speak for himself. "There is no assembly" (ἐκκλησία), says Zoeckler, "without some one to guide and watch over it; no "kingdom (βασιλεία), nor people (λαός), without government; "no house without a housekeeper and servants; no temple "without bricks and mortar; no field, garden, or vineyard, "without labourers; in fine, there is no living body without a "head and members. . . . And therefore with the Church "Christ instituted the Apostolate as the type and pattern of all "spiritual functions: the preaching of the word (Matth. X.; "XXVIII. 20; Luke XXIV. 47 seq.), the administration of the "Sacraments (Matth. XXVIII. 19; Luke XXII. 19), and the

"handling of the so-called keys of binding and loosing, i.e. "ecclesiastical discipline for giving an assurance (!) that sins "are or are not forgiven. (Matth. XVI. 19; XVIII. 18; John "XX. 22). The early Church fulfilled these ordinances of "Christ to the letter."[26]

12. These institutions must likewise continue in the post-Apostolic Church. For after the death of the Apostles, guidance and government, the administration of the Sacraments, the application of the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross, and the forgiveness of sins were as necessary as ever. If then Christ wished to save all men of all ages, He must have provided the means necessary for the realization of His scheme. Man, indeed, has no right to dictate to the Almighty how he must set to work to save man. God's intentions are known from His own revelation. But we are justified, seeing what Christ has ordained and destined for all time, to draw conclusions as to His intentions; we are justified in seeing the finger of divine providence in what the Church, guarded by the Spirit of Christ, has taught and done from the beginning. And with all the more reason, since the direct and indirect sources of information are in accord, especially in the doctrine that the Church was built on the foundation of the Apostles, and that their successors have preserved intact the Apostolic teaching and Spirit.

Our Lord promised His Apostles that the Holy Spirit should remain with them for ever (John XIV. 16). Nay, when sending them on their mission, and certainly addressing none but Apostles, He said: "Behold I am with you all days, even to "the consummation of the world" (Matth. XXVIII. 20). This could not apply merely to the Apostles personally. For even were it suggested that they hoped to live to see Christ's second coming (Parousia), the same cannot be said of Christ, who spoke the words; for He had a higher, i.e., a divine knowledge. Moreover, at the time when S. Matthew's Gospel was written,

26 *Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaft*, I. 746.

there could be no doubt that some Apostles, at least, were not destined to live till the second coming. Again, the view opened out in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians is much wider, and it grows wider still in the Second Epistle of S. Peter. In S. John's Gospels, too, the opinion that the beloved disciple was not to see death until the Lord came, is flatly contradicted. So the writers of the Gospels firmly believed that the Apostles were to live on in the Church in some other way.

13. How, then, do the Apostles continue to live in the Church? Do they, perchance, live in their writings? Are these writings really of such a character that in them the Apostles "exercise their Apostolic calling in the world to this "day, and render all Apostolic succession superfluous, as it "also seems impossible for any but eye-witnesses."[27] But the Apostles very seldom refer to their writings; and when they do, they have in view the special circumstances of those whom they are addressing. For the rest, they appeal to their preaching, their teaching, and their ordinances. Valuable as the Epistles are for later times, they are not an adequate substitute for personal activity. Nor, indeed, were they intended to be such; otherwise all the Apostles would have written, and all their writings would have been something over and above mere occasional papers. The Apostles themselves must continue to live spiritually in the Apostolic Church. S. Augustine says that were it not for the authority of the Church, he would not believe in Christ; for, not having seen Him, he was unable to believe any but eye-witnesses. "How am I to believe men "who speak to me about Christ, when they have not seen "Him?" Believe the scriptures, says some one. Yes, but any writing, containing new, unheard of statements, or having but few recommendations, is not believed without proof; it is not believed for its own sake, but for the sake of its sponsors.[28]

27 Beyschlag, p. 73 Hase, p. 102.
28 *De Util. cred.* xiv. 31.

14. But the Apostles went a step further. Besides preaching and teaching and writing, they gradually *organized* the churches. At first the several communities were allowed great latitude in the management of their own affairs. This policy was a necessity, particularly in the Gentile communities which could not, like the Jewish, take pattern by priestly institutions. Everything in them was, to a certain extent, in a state of flux. For which reason the Apostles were often compelled to intervene either by writing or in person; but they were also compelled to make arrangements for their temporary or prolonged absence. To learn what these arrangements consisted in, we must again turn to the inspired history of the Apostolic Church.

In the church of Jerusalem early mention is made of its representatives. These must have had, as we may suppose, certain well-defined rights. Paul and Barnabas were sent to the "ancients" in Jerusalem (Acts XII. 30) and to the "Apostles and priests [πρεσβύτεροι]" (XV. 2). Besides these, the Church is specially named (XV. 6). The decree was drawn up by the Apostles and ancients with the whole Church (v. 22), and was sent forth as emanating from the Apostles and ancients (v. 23). When Paul went to Jerusalem unto James, all the ancients were assembled. (XXI. 18). This board, whether akin or not to the Jewish Sanhedrin, was an organization, with the Apostles as directors, which, in conjunction with the Apostles and on their behalf, regulated the affairs of the Church. In what relation it stood to other churches, is clear from what we read of the church at Antioch. The Christian communities that radiated from Jerusalem vied with other Jews of the dispersion in keeping up their connection with Jerusalem. This we gather from the Epistle of James, addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad," in which "ancients" of the Church are mentioned. From Hegesippus and Jerome we learn that James was succeeded by Simeon, who took

up the same position as James, and thus established Apostolic continuity.

In the Gentile Christian communities a similar organization must have been gradually springing up. The Charismata drop more and more into the background, while the ecclesiastical offices come to the front and endure. How far these, at the outset are to be regarded as personal offices in local government, cannot be ascertained, because it is still a moot point, whether heathen brotherhoods *(collegia tenuiorum)* or Jewish Christian communities were taken as the model on which the Gentile communities were fashioned. At all events one fact stands out clearly in the Epistles: that there existed an organization recognized by the Apostles. Superiors, men set over others (προϊστάμενοι) are maintained (I Thess. v. 12), and the members of the Church are commanded to obey them when they are discharging their duties of teaching and correcting. (I Cor. xvi. 16). The allusion to rulers in Rom. xii. 8 implies a general institution. And when bishops and deacons are named in Philip. i. 1, we are within our right in assuming that by them are meant the rulers and leaders of the Church. And this is all the more likely, as this letter was written on the Apostle's last journey, during which, having a presentiment of the fate that awaited him, he was making provision for the government of the churches. In the address to the "sincere companion," who is entreated to take care of Evodia and Syntyche (iv. 3), we may discern glimmerings of the position occupied by the first bishop of the See. For in this, as in other Epistles, Paul immediately goes on to speak of his "fellow-labourers" as distinct from himself. And in the Epistle to the Colossians, Archippus is bidden to take heed to the ministry which he had received in the Lord. (Col. iv. 17; Philem. 2).

This view derives confirmation from the Acts, in which it is related that Paul and Barnabas ordained priests for the faithful in every church, and commended them with prayer

and fasting to the Lord. (XIV. 23). Hence there is nothing surprising in Paul summoning the "elders of the Church" to Ephesus, before his departure for Miletus. And here is another point worthy of note, as bearing on the connection between the rulers and the bishops, and on the official position they held. The Apostle solemnly assures them that he has withheld nothing of the counsel of God from them, and he bids them attend to the flock, wherein the Holy Ghost placed them bishops to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. (XX. 28). In these words he brings out two points: first, that the bishops are the depositaries of apostolic doctrine; second, that they were appointed by the Holy Ghost, not by the community, to succeed the Apostles in governing the Church.

In S. Peter's first Epistle we find the pastoral office fully developed. The phrases he uses are noteworthy, as they enable us to define with greater precision other statements in the letter. The Church is the flock of God, which the ancients, of whom Peter is one (V. 1.), are to feed, after the example of Christ, "the shepherd and bishop of our souls." (II. 25). This simile of the good shepherd shows that they are admonished to do more than lend a helping hand to the sick. Nor, again, in the Epistle of S. James (V. 14) do the priests appear as curing bodily ailments; for prayer as well as oil, is indicated as a means of restoration to health. And the Apostle adds: "And if he be in sins they shall be forgiven "him." The second and third Epistles of S. John likewise go to show that the ancients held high office. Diotrephes, mentioned in the third Epistle, appears armed with Episcopal power, like the angels of the churches in the Apocalypse.[29] Whatever reference the institution of presbyters may have had to Israel, it is clear that the Apostles considered them as the priests of the new covenant, as chosen not according to genealogy, but by the communication of the Holy Spirit, to

29 Döllinger, p. 329. On the opposite side Weizsäcker, p. 640. 669

lead the New Israel, the holy priesthood, the royal race.[30] The prelates (ἡγούμενοι) mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews are certainly more than mere officials of the community over which they were set; for they in the first instance preached the word of God to it, and moreover they had to give an account of it. From the first Epistle of Clement it appears that they were equal to bishops.

15. A closer view of this organization is obtained in the Pastoral Epistles. Timothy and Titus, to whom they were addressed, appear as the plenipotentiaries of S. Paul, who, by prayer and the imposition of hands, had constituted them his representatives. To Timothy he says: "This precept I command to thee," "according to the "prophecies going before thee. . . ." (I Tim. I. 18). And again: "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which "was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands "of the priesthood" (IV. 14) "and of my hands" (II. Tim. I. 6). In virtue of this office he charges him to exercise discretion in appointing bishops; and he gives him advice in order that, should the Apostle tarry long in coming, he may know how to conduct himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth (I Tim. III. 15). He tells him, too, how bishops are to be chosen: "Impose not hands lightly "upon any man, neither be partaker of other men's sins" (V. 22). And he lays a similar injunction on Titus: "For "this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst . . . "ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee" (Titus I. 15). At the same time he enumerates the requisite qualifications for a presbyter and bishop.

The two names, presbyter and bishop, were, indeed, somewhat freely interchanged; but there is no denying the material distinction between them. For whenever they are grouped together, bishops, like Apostles, always stand first. Again, in both verses of the Pastoral Epistles (I Tim. III. 2; Titus I. 7), the

30 See Leo M., Sermo I. 2.

word bishop is used in the singular, although in *Titus* it is both preceded and followed by references to the presbyters. A gradation of presbyters with a "monarchical head" would seem to be discernible in I Tim. v. 17. The interchange of names probably originated with the custom of choosing the bishops from among the presbyters.[33] From this it cannot, indeed, be conclusively proved that bishops are an essentially higher grade; but only that, in the government of the Church, they occupied a distinguished position at the head of the priesthood. "The bishop no longer appears as a delegate of the Church (!), "but as a man appointed by Apostolic authority, and invested "with divine power."[34] But those who appointed and ordained bishops with the consent of the Church were the immediate successors of the Apostles, and they conferred on them the grace they themselves had received from the Apostles. In this sense, therefore, these bishops are also successors of the Apostles. It is evident, however, that those bishops who were appointed by the Apostles themselves to the chief Churches [immediate successors], must occupy the first place in the Apostolicity of the Church. Hence the Pastoral Epistles are of the highest importance; and one of the reasons why their genuineness has been challenged is precisely because they are so pronounced in their testimony to the fact and nature of ecclesiastical organization.

Thus Holy Scripture fully corrobates what one would naturally have surmised. The Apostles neither could, nor would leave the flock, entrusted to them, without shepherds, nor the Church without teachers and rulers. They continued to live in their successors. Hence the Church is Apostolic, not only because she is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, but because the Apostolic office survives in her. This was so patent in the beginning from the very fact that she

33 Weizsäcker, p. 37. Petavius, *Diss. eccl.* l. 1. 2. *De eccl. hier.* l. 4. Perrone, *Prael. Theol.*, Ratisbonae 1855. Tom. ix. S. 104.

34 Schenkel, *Christusbild*, p. 165. Holtzman, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 229.

was a living organization, that proof was deemed superfluous. Only when contentions and schisms arose, did it become necessary to remind the faithful that they must be united and obedient to Apostolic authority.

II. TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.

15. *Clement* of Rome, one of the earliest successors of S. Peter, had occasion to speak of this matter. Briefly and pithily he sums up the meaning and importance of the Apostolic office. "The Apostles were sent to preach the Gospel by "Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ was sent by God. Christ, "then, is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ; and "both were ordained according to God's good pleasure. . . "And when they preached the Gospel up and down the "country, they took their first-fruits, and after proving them by "the Spirit, set them as bishops and deacons over the faithful."[35] Here we are less concerned with the special formal principle of Tradition, than with the general material principle of authority and office.* Clement quotes our Lord's saying, "As the "Father hath sent me, I also send you." And he proceeds to give it, as was fitting, a wider application. His commentary is thus a very decided and very necessary step in advance. The Apostles imparted the gift they had received to others, foreseeing that strifes would arise about the Episcopate; and hence with prudent forethought they appointed and ordained those whom *they had proved*, so that when they were gone, other trusty men would be at hand to take their place. So, at least, Clement expressly informs us.[36]

Next to the Bishops, Clement praises the Presbyters, whom

* By the *formal principle of Tradition* is meant the divine authority to teach, or, the rule of faith; that is to say, the faith of believers depends on the ever-living Apostolic magisterium. The author quotes S. Clement's words to prove that there continued in the Church not only this special authority, but Apostolic authority to rule and govern in general. Tr.

35 *Ad Cor.* I. 42.

36 *L. c.* c. 44. It is a disputed point whether the ministry referred to is that of the Apostles (Rothe, Döllinger, Brüll and others), or that of Bishops and Deacons (Funk, Gebhardt, Harnack).

he twice only designates as men of advanced years. Of course it is still a disputed point, whether Clement used the words Bishop and Priest (Bishop and Deacon) promiscuously. Some think that the bishopric of Corinth was vacant at the time, as Clement mentions only presidents and presbyters.[37] Be that as it may, we have to bear in mind two things: firstly, that Clement is acquainted with Overseers or Bishops (in the plural)[38] and with men who bore the honoured title of presbyter, and represented the community; and secondly, that this organization was instituted by the Apostles. For the Pastoral Epistles are admittedly dominated by the very same conditions (I Tim. IV. 16, however, seems to mark an advance), as the Epistles of Clement and the Pastor of Hermas. The latter, while enumerating the ecclesiastical offices (viz. Apostles, Bishops, Doctors, Deacons) omits the Presbyters, to whom, however, he assigns a prominent place in the community. But Clement himself ranks as a Bishop in the Pastor of Hermas[39] as clearly as in Irenæus and Tertullian.

Clement, indeed, views Bishops chiefly in relation to the Liturgy, and Hermas mentions prophets and doctors as well as Bishops. But from this it does not follow that he denied the "teaching office" to Bishops. For in the Epistle to the Ephesians, doctors and rulers are set side by side with the Apostles, and yet no one will contend that Apostles were not doctors. (I Cor. XII. 38). In the Pastoral Epistles, again, Timothy is specially exhorted to preserve the deposit of faith intact. Clement is thoroughly conversant with the duties of a Bishop. According to him the Bishop is the spiritual guide and responsible leader of the community. His divine mission to discharge these duties of his office constitutes the very essence of the Episcopate. In this teaching of Clement we

37 Döllinger, p. 311.

38 Weizsäcker, p. 639 seq.

39 Lipsius, *Bibelexicon* III. 23. Funk, *PP. Apost. ad Hermam Vis.* II. 4. Iren. III. 1. Tertull., *De Praescr.* c. 32.

have every reason for seeing the true New Testament doctrine on the character of the Apostolic hierarchy. He was the first to draw the consequences from the principle of apostolicity. On this point (hierarchy?) great diversity of opinion prevails, owing to the fact "that thinkers have, consciously or un-"consciously, allowed their judgment to be warped by later "institutions."[40] This circumstance, too, will account for the curious phenomenon of many writers looking at the same object and each seeing in it something quite different. To some the ecclesiastical organization of this early age seems full-blown episcopalianism; to others stark presbyterianism; while others see in it democracy pure and simple. Of course, unless there were a large field over which speculation might freely roam, such strange diversity would be impossible. Then again, as some one has remarked, the truth will never be in sight until we form a just appreciation of the very peculiar circumstances that swayed those early ages. And it should be remembered that these men are, in this matter, our only sources of information. Now we would ask, whether writers who talk airily about Clementine fictions, are on the right road to success? How, for instance, could Clement have championed Episcopal authority against the strife-loving Corinthians, if it had been an unknown quantity or a moot point, and if it had been necessary first to trace it back to the Apostles?

Is it possible that the Corinthians, forty years after S. Paul's departure from their midst, were quite in the dark as to this momentous ecclesiastical institution? It must have been easy to trace their line of bishops to S. Paul. Clement does not hesitate to remind them of the Princes of the Apostles and of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The same difficulty may be urged against those also who conclude from Clement and the *Didache* that bishops and deacons were primarily nothing but liturgical ministers, and that it was the Gnostic crisis which first welded the Church into a compact organization,

40 Weizsäcker, p. 606.

and gave rise to the apostolic and episcopal idea.[41] Now this last hypothesis is directly refuted by Clement himself, for he most certainly teaches that bishops were instituted by the Apostles.

16. Again the Ignatian Epistles are clear evidence of the Episcopal system. These letters reach back only to the early beginnings of Gnosticism, and yet they exhibit the "Catholic "idea as an ecclesiastical ideal already realized." Is it not then written on the face of history that the germ of the ecclesiastical organization as described by S. Paul was by this time fully matured and developed?

It is certainly indisputable that ecclesiastical institutions in the Apostolic age were still in a fluctuating and transitional state; they were unfinished, and had not yet set. But, as the Church expanded, and the Apostles were nearing their end, they began to consolidate. Surely if the authority of the rulers grew after the death of the Apostles, when the several churches were thrown on their own resources, such growth implies plantation. Who could have planted, if not the Apostles? A jealous independence would have quickly blighted the attempt of any bishop to exalt himself above the priestly college, unless such primacy had been warranted by his apostolic office. How could Clement have drawn a sharp dividing line between clergy and laity (40. 4), and insisted on the irremovability of bishops, if the Corinthians had seen the contrary practice at work? Here, too, there is gradual development, not innovation. "It "is not correct," says even Schaefer, "to look upon the "Episcopate in itself as a false hierarchial principle, and to "regard the constitution of the post-Apostolic Church as a "defection from primitive Apostolicity. On the contrary, the "last period of Apostolic times shows the connecting link, "and contains the subsequent development in germ. On no "other supposition is its [Episcopate] origin intelligible." By

41 Clem., i. 40-44. *Didache*, c. 15 Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* i. 155 Note 1 Hase, p. 93. Tschakert, p. 19.

this we may estimate at its true worth the view broached by Tschakert and others : "The rise of episcopal sacerdo- "talism towards the close of the second century, as seen "in the ancient Catholic Church, and in the still more re- "cent popedom, constitutes a breach with the constitu- "tion of the Apostolic churches." When Jerome declaims against the pride of bishops,[42] his passionate denunciation must be measured by the violence of his quarrel with Bishop John of Jerusalem. In another passage he allows, at the very least, that confirmation and ordination fall within a bishop's province.[43] "The Church consists of many grades, all ending in Deacons, Priests and Bishops."

17. Some writers have had the hardihood to assert that the Fathers paid little heed to Apostolic Succession. On the contrary, it is a point on which they are most keen. In their controversy with the Gnostics, it was paramount and had to be emphasised all the more as these heretics were appealing in their own justification to a secret Apostolic tradition. The Apologists in the second century took pains to collect the historical proofs, and it is owing to their industry that we are now able to trace the succession in some of the apostolic Churches. The succession is easiest traced in the case of the Roman Church ; and it is on this proof that the Apologists delight to dwell.* Our chief informant for the Roman Church is *Hegesippus*, who

42 *Ad Titum* I. 7. See *Decretum Gratiani* P I. ; D. xcv. c. 5.

43 *Ep.* 146 *Ad Lucif.* at the end.

* Irenæus, *adv. haer*, iii. 2. "Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a vol- "ume as this, to reckon up the succession of all the churches, we do put to "confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, "by vain glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized "meetings; [we do this, I say] by indicating that tradition derived from the "Apostles, of *the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church* "*founded and organised at Rome* by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and "Paul; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to "our time by means of the succession of the bishops. *For it is a matter of neces-* "*sity that every church should agree with this church*, on account of its pre- "eminent authority, that is the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolical "tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist "everywhere. III. 3. The blessed Apostles, then, having founded and built up "the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of

travelled about with the express purpose of examining the doctrines and tracing the Apostolic succession of the principal churches. Moreover he sojourned in Rome till the year 156. From him and also from *Irenæus* (d. 202)—both agree on this point, but differ from later catalogues of popes—we learn that Linus was the first bishop of Rome after the Apostles (Peter and Paul), Anacletus the second; then Clement, the author of the aforementioned letter to the Corinthians, which contains references to the martyrdom of the princes of the Apostles in Rome, and to S. Paul's work in Corinth. Hegesippus goes on to remark that on his travels he found the same constitution, the same succession, and the same doctrine in all the Churches.

As to Antioch, we hear from Eusebius,[44] that Evodius followed Peter as first bishop of the church, and Ignatius the martyr came next. As to Jerusalem, our informant is once more Hegesippus who tells us that in the year 71 the surviving Apostles (John, Philip and Andrew) and the relations of Jesus met together in Jerusalem, and unanimously chose Simeon, the son of Cleophas, a cousin of our Lord, for the new bishop. In Asia Minor, the well-informed Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp (d. 155) who was a disciple of an apostle, tells us that Polycarp was set by the Apostles as bishop of Smyrna. He calls him a "blessed and apostolic priest."[45] Polycrates appeals to him as the bishop and faithful witness of Smyrna. He relates of him-

"this Linus Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded "Anacletus; and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was "allotted the bishopric. . . . . To this Clement then succeeded Evaristus. "Alexander followed Evaristus; then, sixth from the Apostles, Sixtus was appointed; after him Telesphorus, who was gloriously martyred. Then Hyginus, "after him Pius, then after him, Anicetus. Soter having succeeded Anicetus, "Eleutherius does now, *in the twelfth place from the Apostles*, hold the *inheritance* of the Episcopate. In this order, *and by this succession*, the ecclesiastical "tradition from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth come down to us. "And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, "which has been preserved in the Church from the Apostles until now, and handed "down in truth."—(Clarke's Translation).

44 *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 22. 36. See Döllinger, p. 324.

45 *Epist. ad. Flor.* apud Euseb. H. E. v. 23, 7; 27, 4. 6.

self in his sixty-fifth year, that he was the eighth bishop in his family. And since he appeals for this reason to the traditions of his relatives and ancestors, he bears certain testimony to a line of bishops in one family stretching back to Apostolic times. Hence the well-informed Clement of Alexandria could write: "After John had returned to Ephesus from Patmos, "he travelled about among the neighbouring Gentile districts, "appointing bishops, setting the affairs of the churches in "order, and enrolling among the clergy those whom the Spirit "indicated."[46]

To charge these venerable witnesses of the faith with falsifying history is to deal a blow at their honour. This is Tschakert's achievement when he says that "monarchical "bishops first saw the light in the days of Irenæus, and "that the theory that they had always existed is consequently "untenable. Out of this delusion have grown the lines of "bishops of the most notable of the Christian Churches. For "by selecting the most distinguished from the ranks of the "rulers, and arranging them in order back to the days of "the Apostles, men have succeeded in forging a sort of "historical proof for the figment of "apostolic succession."[47] Flippant talk this about the saints and martyrs of the second century! Why, Irenæus himself stretches back through Polycarp to John! Add to this what has been already said about the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius, and the chain of historical and theological proof will be complete. James' work in Jerusalem, John's in Ephesus, Peter's in Antioch and Rome (Mark's in Alexandria), has always been regarded as official and not personal. The interests of the churches demanded that on the death of the Apostles there should be either vicars or successors. And history bears witness that this course was actually followed. What must we think of these holy men, yea of the Holy Spirit guiding

46 See Döllinger, p. 325.
47 P. 32. See also Hase, p. 102.

the Church, if since the close of the second century, the Church has gone astray on a point so vital to the maintainance of unity,—as the Episcopal system? if the whole course of development has been diverted into a wrong channel, by "transferring to the Episcopal office, as such, that which originally "belonged to the Apostles and presbyters merely in their "personal capacity?"[48] But if, as is frankly conceded, the "names of Clement and Ignatius, Hermas and Polycarp, "Irenæus and Cyprian mark the transition from the post-"apostolic to the Nicene period," then we need only add the pastoral Epistles of S. Paul to show that, in the Catholic Church, the chain of apostolic succession from Christ and the Apostles to our own day has been unbroken.

18. And this Tradition gains strength from two causes: firstly, it was part of the living faith of the Church; secondly and chiefly, it was the shield of faith that parried the blows of heretics. An institution that has grown up with the Christian's daily life and worship, even if men had wished, could not have been violently changed and wrenched from its place; still less could it have gained universal acceptance in the Catholic Church. Can any one believe that S. *Ignatius*, when on his way to Rome to die (about 107), drew his solemn admonition from any other source but the deep conscious faith that prevailed in the Apostolic Church at Antioch? Let critics wrangle over his Epistles and appraise them as they will, the fact remains that they are a powerful testimony to what Christians, at the beginning of the second century, believed on the monarchical idea of the Catholic Church, as Ignatius first calls it, and on the division of the clergy into bishops, priests, and deacons.

In words oft repeated and impressive he exhorts the faithful to come together to the one temple and one altar, to Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father, and has returned to Him, and abides with Him. He entreated them, by the charity

48 Th. Harnack apud Zöckler, iii. 588.

of Jesus Christ, to rally round one another and the priesthood in the bishop, to honour the bishop as God, and to do nothing without him. "Obey the bishops, the priests and deacons, "since they are appointed by Christ's orders." "Without these "there is no Church; on this point, I believe, you are agreed." "I am mortgaging my life for them that are subject to the "bishop, the priests, and the deacons." Bishops and priests are the successors of the Apostles. Bishops have preeminence as God's representatives, and the priests hold the place of the Apostolic college. Hence the faithful must be obedient to the bishop and to one another, as Christ in the flesh obeyed His Father, and the Apostles obey Christ and the Father and the Spirit, in order that they may be one both in the flesh and in the Spirit. The teachings (precepts) of the Apostles must be followed as those of the Lord. Hence nothing must be done without the bishop; and they must also be subject to the priests, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ. "Each of you, "chiefly the priests, should give to the bishop the honour of "the Father, of Jesus Christ, and the Apostles."[49]

Can it then be matter for wonder that Apostolicity has been systematically recorded, since the middle of the second century, as the one decisive test of doctrine, writing, and discipline, and of communion in the grace and charity of the Church? Only in the agreement of the Apostolic Churches, whose succession can be established beyond doubt, and above all of the Roman Church, sanctified by the blood of the princes of the Apostles, can truth and authority be found. For in the succession of bishops lies the only security that doctrine has been kept pure, the true stores of grace dispensed, and fellowship with Christ maintained. Christ was sent by the Father, the Apostles by Christ, and the bishops by the Apostles. "The preaching of "the Church, the teaching of the Apostles, the rule of truth, "the rule of faith have, since the second century, been the

49 *Ad. Ephes.* 4. *Smyrn.* 9. *Magnes.* 3, 13. *Philad.* 1. *Trall.* 3. *Polyc.* 6. *Magnes.* 6, 13. 2, *Trall.* 7, 1; 2, 2; 3, 1. 3; 12, 2.

"usual designation for that body of truths and facts, which the "Apostles delivered when they preached the Gospel.[50]

19. A brief summary of Apostolic teaching is contained in the so-called *Apostles' Creed.* Its very name shows that the Church must be Apostolic in faith and doctrine and means of grace. Even if it did not formally emanate from the Apostles, it contains the faith of the Apostles as confessed by the Church. The baptismal formula (Matth. XXVIII. 19) is without doubt its groundwork. From the baptismal confession of faith it sprang. It is also noteworthy that the Roman Church possesses the oldest form of this creed, and uses it in her office to this day. "The importance attaching, under such "circumstances, to the Roman symbol, and to the position "occupied by the Roman Church in Catholic development is "so unmistakably clear that he who runs may read."[51]

20. *Irenæus*, however, is generally credited with giving full and conscious expression to the principle of the Church's Apostolicity in doctrine and discipline, and with having set it on a scientific basis. He is said to have been the first to erect it into a theory, by proclaiming the definite interpretation of the formula of baptism to be the Apostolic *regula veritatis.* The proof for the "Apostolic character of this body of doctrines "he grounded on the fact that they have come down from the "Churches founded by the Apostles, and that these Churches "have preserved the Apostolic teaching without change."[52] Irenæus does, indeed, state the principle of the Apostolic rule of truth, the principle of "Tradition" or of "faith," with such clear and earnest conviction, that we are obliged to suppose that he had in mind not merely a "set formula of confession," on the meaning of which no doubt existed, but that he was equally certain of its Apostolic origin and incorrupt preservation

50 Probst, *Lehre und Gebet in den drei ersten christl. Iahrhund.* Tübingen 1871, p. 41. 76. Scheele, apud Zöckler, II. 391. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I. 107.

51 Harnack, p. 259. Anm. 1. Scheele [Caspari] ap. Zöeckler, II. 393.

52 Harnack, p. 262.

by tradition. On both points he speaks with no uncertain sound.

Irenæus begins his exposition of the rule of faith in these words: "The Church spread all over the world to the ends of "the earth has received this faith from the Apostles and their "disciples."[53] The *unbroken succession of apostles* vouched for the purity of the faith. None but the *Apostolic Church* can be the true Church, because she alone has the certain tradition from the Apostles. This is the faith of apostolic men; this is the idea of the true Church, implanted in their hearts, received from the Apostles, and sealed with their blood. From the days of the Apostles until now she cannot but teach everywhere the same doctrines without interruption and without change. In this the true Church is distinguished from the sects. Agreement with the Apostolic Church is a proof of truth. The sects follow their own spirit, and outstrip one another in invention, "because they are built not on the one rock, but on the shifting "sands." "So they stand convicted of being the disciples, not "of the Apostles, but of their own perverse opinions."[54] "There "is no need then for men to seek from others the truth that "can be found easily in the Church. For the Apostles have "deposited in the Church, as in a rich vessel, all that apper"tains to truth, so that all who will may drink at her hands "the waters of life. For she is the way to life; all others are "thieves and robbers. Them therefore we must shun; but we "must embrace, with all diligence, whatever belongs to the "Church, and to the tradition of truth."

Where, however, are we to look for this Church? To whom shall we turn? He answers: "Suppose there arise a dispute "relative to some important question among us, should we not "have recourse to the most ancient churches, with which the "Apostles held constant intercourse, and learn from them what "is certain and clear in regard to the present question?" For

53 *Adv. Haer.* i. 10, 1; v. 20, 1

54. *L. c.* i. 28, 1; iii. 24, 2; 12, 7; 4, 1; iv. 26, 2 seq

since the Apostles committed the Church to the care of the bishops, the bishops must be the genuine successors of the Apostles. Men must hearken to priests and obey them, because the Episcopate, in virtue of succession, has received, by God's will, a sure charisma of truth. And even if there are priests who indulge their passions, still "the Church is ever "fostering priests, who by holding fast to the sound doctrine of "the Apostles, and leading irreproachable lives, confirm and "reform the rest." Wherever is the Apostolic succession there, without fail, is the Apostolic tradition. "We are in a position "to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted "bishops in the Churches, and [to demonstrate] the succession "of these men to our own times. Those who neither sought "nor knew of anything like what these (heretics) rave about. "For if the Apostles (as the Gnostics hold) had known hidden "mysteries, which they were in the habit of imparting to the "perfect, apart and privily from the rest, assuredly they would "have taught them in the first place to those to whom they "committed the churches themselves."[56] But as it would take too long to establish the succession in all Churches, Irenæus thinks it sufficient to point to the greatest and most ancient Church,—the Church founded at Rome by the glorious Apostles Peter and Paul,—to the tradition it had inherited from the Apostles, to the faith which was preached to men, and which through the succession of bishops has come down to our own time.

Apostolicity, then, is the decisive test of a Church. Whatever is more recent than the Apostles, or has no connection with the Apostolic Church, is no part of the true Church. "The character of the body of Christ consists in the succession "of bishops, to whom the Apostles entrusted the respective "Churches." "All heretics come much later than the bishops, "to whom the Apostles have committed the Church." The Church existed among barbarous tribes, before they ever heard the name, let alone the tenets of the sects. We can point out

[56] *L. c.* iii. 1. See Massuet, *Diss.* iii. n. 20.

the beginning and founder of every heresy, for they are of subsequent date; but the beginnings of the Catholic Church are traceable to none other than Christ and His Apostles. Valentinus, Marcion, Cerdon and Menander apostatised long after, when the Church was in mid career. Such is the doctrine of Irenæus.[56]

21. *Tertullian* follows Irenæus in every particular. He, too, sees in the baptismal confession of faith, that is, the *regula fidei*, and in apostolicity the groundwork of the Church. Agreement with the rule of faith is the test of truth, because the rule of faith was delivered by the Apostles. Truth will come to those only who walk in this rule, which the Church has handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God.[57] And who are the representatives of this Church? The bishops who come down in a direct line from the Apostles, for the disciples of the Apostles could not teach aught but what they had learnt from the Apostles. "But if there be any "(heresies) which are bold enough to plant themselves in "the midst of the apostolic age, that they may thereby "seem to have been handed down by the Apostles, because "they existed in the time of the Apostles, we can say: Let "them then produce the original records (*origines*) of their "churches, and let them unfold the roll of their bishops, "running down in *due succession* from the beginning in "such a manner that their first (distinguished) bishop "shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor "some one of the Apostles or of the Apostolic men,—a "man, moreover, *who continued steadfast with the Apostles.* "For this is the manner in which the Apostolic Churches "transmit their registers: as the church of Smyrna, "which records that Polycarp was placed therein by "John; as also the church of Rome, which makes "Clement to have been ordained in like manner by

56 *Adv. Haer*, v. 20, 1; iii. 4, 2. 3; 26, 5.

57 *De Praescr*, c. 37. See Harnack, p. 262. Kolberg, *Cultus und Disciplin der Kirche nach den Schriften Tertullians*. Braunsberg, 1886.

"Peter. In exactly the same way the other churches likewise "exhibit (their several worthies) whom, as having been "appointed to their episcopal places by Apostles, they regard "as transmitters of the Apostolic seed. Let heretics contrive "(*confingant*) something of the same kind. For, after their "blasphemy, what is there unlawful for them (to attempt)? "But should they even effect the contrivance, they will not "advance a step. For their very doctrine, after comparison "with that of the Apostles, will declare, by its own diversity "and contrariety, that it had for its author neither an Apostle "nor an Apostolic man; because as the Apostles would never "have taught things which were self-contradictory, so the "Apostolic men would not have inculcated teaching different "from the Apostles, unless they who received their instruction "from the Apostles went and preached in a contrary manner. "*To this test*, therefore, will they be submitted for proof by "those churches, who, although they derive not their founder "from Apostles or Apostolic men (as being of much later date, "for they are in fact being founded daily), yet, since they agree "in the same faith, they are accounted not less Apostolic, "because they are akin in doctrine (*pro consanguinitate "doctrinæ*). Then let all the heresies, when challenged by "our Church to these two tests, offer their proof of how they "deem themselves *Apostolic*."[58] Further on he says, "Come "now, you who would indulge a better curiosity, if you would "apply it to the business of your salvation, run over the "Apostolic churches, in which the very thrones (*cathedrae*, "*chairs*) of the Apostles are still pre-eminent in their places "(*suis locis praesident*), in which their own authentic writings "are read, uttering the voice and representing the face of each "of them severally. Achaia is very near you, (in which) you "find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia, you "have Philippi, and the Thessalonians. Since you are able to

58 *De Præscript.* c. 32. (Clark's Transl.) See Probst, *Die Kirchliche Disciplin.* Tübingen 1873. p. 33 seq.

"cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. Since, moreover, you are "close upon Italy, you have Rome, *from which there comes even* "*into our own hands the very authority* (of Apostles themselves). "How happy is its Church, on which Apostles poured forth all "doctrine along with their blood."[59] But what a picture he draws, on the other hand, of the ways and methods of heretical communions. It is worth our while to give it in full, because it applies to modern as well as ancient times. "I must not omit an account of the conduct of the heretics— "how frivolous it is, how worldly, how merely human, without "seriousness, without authority, without discipline, as suits "their creed. To begin with, it is doubtful who is a catechumen, "and who a believer; they have all access alike, they hear "alike, they pray alike—even heathens, if any such happen "to come among them. That which is holy, they will cast to "the dogs, and their pearls, although (to be sure) they are not "real ones, they will fling to the swine (M. VII. 6). Simplicity "they will have to consist in the overthrow of discipline, "attention to which on our part they call *finery*. Peace also "they huddle up anyhow with all comers; for it matters not "to them, however different be their treatment of subjects, "provided only they can conspire together to storm the citadel "of the One only Truth. All are puffed up, all offer you "knowledge. Their catechumens are perfect, before they are "full taught. The very women of these heretics, how wanton "they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, "to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures—it may be, even "to baptize. Their ordinations (too) are carelessly administered, "capricious, changeable. At one time they put *novices* in office; "at another time, men who are bound to some secular employ- "ment; at another, persons who have apostatized from us, "to bind them by vain glory, since they cannot by the truth. "Nowhere is promotion easier, than in the camp of rebels, "where the mere fact of being there is a foremost service.

59 *De Praescr.* c. 36.

"And so it comes to pass that to-day one man is their bishop, "to-morrow another; to day he is a deacon, who to-morrow is "a reader; to-day he is a Presbyter, who to-morrow is a "layman. For even on laymen do they impose the functions of the priesthood." *

The Apostolic Church must be the true Church, because the men whom our Lord sent forth to preach the Gospel were the Apostles. Now, what the Apostles preached can be decided only on the oral or written testimony of the Churches which they founded, and to which they communicated the truth. That doctrine is true which agrees in matters of faith with the original mother-Churches set up by the Apostles. "We hold "communion with the Apostolic Churches, because our doc-"trine is in no respect different [from theirs.] This is [our] "witness of truth."[61]

22. *S. Cyprian's* teaching will be best discussed in the chapter on the Unity of the Church. Here it is sufficient to observe that in his eyes succession is as indispensable to a bishop as ordination. Every one entering the ministry without it is an intruder. "Cornelius," he says, "was made bishop "when the place of Fabian (i.e. of Peter) in the priestly chair "was vacant."[62]

23. The Alexandrine Fathers, likewise, asserted the principle of Apostolicity, though, perhaps, in a somewhat different way. To the false Gnosis they opposed the true, which *Clement* derived from the *secret* teaching of the Apostles. Unlike the Gnostics, however, who pitted their secret tradition against the tradition of the Church, Clement held fast by the rule of faith handed down by the Apostles. But the deeper insight into divine truths is not given to all, but only to the perfect. Irenæus has given voice to the same thought: "Among the "Church's rulers there are both learned and unlearned; the

61 *De Praescr.* c. 21. *Adv. Marci.* iv. 5; v. 19.

62 *Epist.* 55, 8. See Peters, *Der heil. Cyprian.* Regensburg 1877. O. Ritschl, *Cyprian von Carthago*, 1835, p. 67.

* *L. c.* c 41. This quotation has been added by the Translators.

"latter do not diminish the tradition, nor do the former teach "other or more than is contained in the faith; for the disciple "is not above the master." "Only in truth," says Clement, "and in the old Church (i.e. in the Apostolic tradition preserved "in the Church) is true Gnosis, and a right choice to be found." "Our source of truth is the Lord who, by means of the prophets, "the Gospel and the Apostles, leads us into the fulness of all "knowledge."[63] The Catholic Church is older than heretical communities which, not having come fire-new from the Church's mint, are a base counterfeit coin.

24. *Origen* treads in Clement's footsteps, save that he rejects the secret Apostolic tradition. According to him we must "hold steadfastly to the Church's tradition which has "been handed down in an unbroken line from the Apostles, "and has been preserved to this day in the Church. That only "is to be believed as Christian truth which does not deviate by "a hair's breadth from ecclesiastical and Apostolic tradition."[64]

25. This same principle of Apostolicity which we have applied to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, might also be applied to the Canon of Scriptnre. In order to prove whether a doctrine or ecclesiastical institution is Apostolic, we must have recourse to the succession of bishops. In the same way we prove whether a book be canonical or no. Here, however, it must suffice to repeat what has been said in the second volume. None but the writings of the Apostles and their disciples were received into the Canon. Apostolicity was the final test which the Church, herself Apostolic, applied. The Church shows herself to be Apostolic, because she is in possession of the Apostolic writings. This seems like arguing in a circle; but only for those who deny that there is historical succession in the Church, and that she is guided by the Holy Spirit. For such there is no proof either for the Apostolic or any other Scriptures. Had it not been for the Church's watch-

63 *Strom.* vii. 15. See Kuhn, p. 396. Schwane, I. 696.

64 *De Princip.* praef. 1. 2. See Kuhn, p. 376. *Einleitung*, 2 ed. p. 92.

fulness, there would have been no Scriptures for heretics to have. But, inasmuch as they distort them according to their whims and caprices, they are shewn not to belong to the Church. S. Augustine, as we have seen, lays special stress on the authority of the Canon. None but Apostolic writings will he regard, according to tradition, as canonical, i.e. free from error; but he would not believe even the Gospel unless the authority of the Church moved him thereto. And thus he set a seal on the Catholic principle of authority.

26. *S. Augustine*, in his controversies with the Manichæans and Donatists, frequently had an opportunity of setting forth at length the doctrine on the Church: hence on this, as on many other questions, his authority is paramount.[65] On Manes he poured out the vials of his scorn for beginning his letters with the words, "Manes, an Apostle of Jesus Christ." For, asked Augustine, what witnesses, what evidence can he bring to support his claim to Apostleship? [He, whose heresy is well known to have begun not only after Tertullian, but after Cyprian.] . . . "Will he take *our* Apostles as witnesses "(in his favour)? Unless he can find some Apostles in life, "he must read their writings; and these are all against him. ". . . He cannot pretend that the writings have been "tampered with; for that would be to attack the credit of his "own witnesses. Or if he produces his own manuscripts of "the Apostolic writings, he must also obtain for them the "authority of the churches founded by the Apostles them-"selves, by showing that they have been preserved and "transmitted with their sanction. It will be difficult for a man "to make me believe him on the evidence of writings which "derive all their authority from his own word, which I do not "believe." And, again, a little further on, he says: "The "authority of our books, which is confirmed by the agreement "of so many nations, supported by a succession of Apostles, "Bishops, Councils, is against you."[66]

65 See Ginzel, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1849, p. 491. Reuter, *August. Studien*, 1887.
66 *Contra Faust. Manich.* xliii. 4. 5. (Clark's Trl.)

These are not mere conclusions, or inferences from general principles; they are based upon well-known facts of history. The Church is stamped as apostolic by its genealogy, and the succession of its bishops. The Church is the building of Christ, and its supports or pillars are the Apostles. In his commentary on Ps. XLIV. (XLV) 17 "Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to "thee," Augustine traces the connection between the Catholic Church and the Apostles. "It was the Apostles begat thee; "they were *sent*; they were the preachers, they are the *fathers*. "But was it possible for them to be with us in the body for "ever? Although one of them said: 'I desire to depart and to "be with Christ which is far better: to abide in the flesh is "necessary for your sakes.' It is true he said this, but how "long was it possible for him to remain here? Could it be till "this present time, could it be to all futurity? Is the Church "then left desolate by their departure? God forbid. *Instead "of thy fathers children have been born to thee.* What is that?— "The Apostles were sent to thee as fathers; instead of the "Apostles sons have been born to thee; there have been "appointed Bishops. For in the present day, whence do the "Bishops, throughout all the world, derive their origin? The "Church itself calls them fathers; the Church itself brought "them forth and placed them on the throne of the fathers. "Think not thyself abandoned then. . . . Observe how "widely diffused is the 'temple of the king,' that the virgins "that are not led to the temple of the king, may know that they "have nothing to do with that marriage. Instead of thy "fathers, have thy children been born to thee; thou shalt make "them princes over all the earth. This is the Universal Church: "her children have been made princes over all the earth. . . "Let them who are cut off own the truth of this, let them "come to the One Body: let them be led into the temple of "the King. . . ."*

Augustine, moreover, like Irenæus, is convinced that the

* Oxford Translation.

succession of the Roman Church, in which the primacy of the Apostolic chair ever flourishes, is of supreme importance and sufficient for all practical purposes.[67] "When we have to take "into account the order of the succession of Bishops, how "much more sure and truly salutary is our way of reckoning "from S. Peter downward. Peter, to whom, as acting the "part of the whole Church, the Lord had said: 'Upon this "rock I will build my Church.' For Peter was succeeded by "Linus. . . . "[68] He then goes on to enumerate the succession down to Anastasius who was alive at the time he wrote that letter (400). In this long series, he argues, there was not one Donatist. Again, those bishops who cannot lay claim to Apostolic succession, must, at least, be in communion with the Apostolic Churches, and especially with the Roman Church, whose succession is the most evident. It is by means of the Apostolic Chair or See, and by union with it, that particular churches obtain a share in the privilege of Apostolicity.* Hence Caecilian was the rightful Bishop of Carthage, as long

67 *Epist.* xliii

68 *Epist.* liii. 2. See also *Psalm. c. part. Donati.*

* The conditions of Apostolicity are of special importance to the English Reader. It is well known that there is a notion abroad among Anglicans that Apostolicity is secured by valid episcopal orders and some kind of material or local continuity in the episcopal Sees and Churches. On the face of it such a notion is preposterous. For had not the Arian bishops, had not Nestorius, and Apollinaris valid orders? Did they not occupy the sees of orthodox predecessors? And may there not always be some heretical Bishops? Then, again, what about schism? But if heresy and schism destroy the Apostolicity of a bishop and a particular church, clearly something more than valid orders and local continuity is required What is *the* condition? According to S. Augustine and Tertullian it is *communion* with an Apostolic Church, that is, with one whose Apostolic character is beyond doubt, and whose line of bishops in *communion with each other* has been unbroken. In the early ages there were several churches evidently Apostolic, and each one might be appealed to as a test of orthodoxy The Roman Church, moreover, as we learn from Irenæus, Tertullian, and Augustine, might be appealed to at any time not only because she was *de facto* Apostolic like some of the others, but because she was a privileged Apostolic Church, the leading Apostolic Church. This can only mean that she neither would nor could ever cease to be Apostolic. She was Apostolic *de jure* But for many centuries, there has been no Apostolic Church *de facto*, except the Roman, and therefore she has a two-fold right to the privilege. And this right involves a corresponding double duty on the part of particular churches to be in communion with her; as it is the only means of securing their own Apostolicity. Tr.

as he remained in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome.[69]

27. To S. Augustine this demonstration seemed trenchant and clenching. In his eyes it carried absolute conviction with it. Nor is it in any way weakened by the fact that he also appeals, at times, to arguments from Scripture. It is a common opinion of the Fathers that the true Church may be known from Holy Scripture, and that the question may be decided from the Lord's words. Like the other Fathers, Augustine is fully convinced that Scripture proves the truth of that Catholic Church, whose authority induced him to believe the Scriptures. This is said in the letter in which he refers the Donatists to Scripture, in order to contest them on a common ground, and dislodge them from error.[70] For he regards it as a first principle, that there can be but one Church, and that this is the one promised by the prophets, preached by the Apostles, and called Catholic from the beginning.

It is hardly necessary to pursue the argument for the Apostolicity of the Church any further, as it is generally admitted that in Augustine's time the constitution of the Church was fixed once for all. "In the second half of the third century it "was no longer sufficient to hold the Catholic faith; obedience "to bishops became henceforth *de rigueur.*[*] The idea of the "one Episcopal Church gained the ascendant, and thrust into

69 *Epist.* xliii: 7. See Schwane ii. 843.

70 *Epist.* 105, 3 seq. See Bellarm. Tom. II. l. ii. 4, 14. Tournely, Tom. V. p. 38: Stieren. *Irenaeus*, ii. 280.

* The statement of Harnack is as characteristic of a Protestant Theologian as it is meaningless to a Catholic. Had not Christ, forsooth, commanded men to hear and obey the Apostles? Had not the Apostles exacted obedience from believers? Was not the point on which Ignatius the Martyr mainly insisted, the necessity of remaining *in sententia Episcopi*, just as Christ remains *in sententia Patris*? As if there ever had been, or ever could be, a Catholic faith without such obedience! How could the Catholic faith stand its ground and maintain itself, and form a bond of union, if its own authority were liable to be called in question? as if the Catholic faith and obedience to bishops were two ideas necessarily antagonistic! As if, too, obedience to bishops were not an element of obedience to faith! Then, again, what about S. Paul [Ephes. iv.] who, in a far greater degree than the Fathers of the third century, made the Church with its organization that Apostolic Deposit to which the obedience of faith is due? Tr.

"the background the significance of the doctrines of faith as a "bond of unity. The Church resting on the bishops, the "successors of the Apostles and vicars of God, became, by "reason of its foundation, the Apostolic deposit."[71] We accept this as a testimony to the fact that the constitution of the church was at this time settled in the Catholic sense. But as regards the view of its origin expressed therein, we trust we have shewn in the preceding pages, that this organization of the Church was but the natural development of the germ planted by Christ and the Apostles.

28. The *Schoolmen*, one and all, hold that the very idea of a church carries with it the conclusions stated in the present chapter. Gratian's decree simply embodies the words of S. Augustine: "Evidently in a doubt about matters of faith the "authority of the Catholic Church is supreme; for it rests "on the bishops who have succeeded one another in a line "from the sees founded by the Apostles to our own time, "and on the agreement of so many peoples."[72] And S. Thomas says: "It is to be noted that the Apostles and their successors "are Christ's vicars in the government of the Church, which is "built on faith and the sacraments of faith. And as they may "not found another Church, so neither may they hand down "any other faith or institute any other sacraments. But the "Church is said to be built up by the Sacraments that flowed "from the side of Christ, as He was hanging on the cross."[73]

29. So firm and universal was this conviction that even heretics have felt themselves obliged to claim Apostolic Tradition in support of their tenets and their church. But the apologists dismissed their claims, with the summary remark that the founders of the sects were all more recent than the Apostles. S. Augustine after calling upon them to walk in the paths of Catholic belief which Christ and the Apostles

71 Harnack, p. 310.
72 P. I. D. xi. c. 9
73 III. 64 a ad 2.

and their successors have pointed out to us, puts into a heretic's mouth the following objection: "This is ridiculous, you will "say, for all claim alike to possess and to teach this one way." The Saint then goes on to say, that he cannot indeed, deny[74] that all put forward this contention, but in so doing they cover themselves with ridicule. For how silly and foolish the Donatists must be to suppose that the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church had been all at once squeezed into one small corner of Africa!

30. *Protestants*, likewise, were not slow to perceive how necessary it was to show that their doctrine and belief concerning the Church were of Apostolic origin. Over and over again the taunt was thrown in their teeth: "The true Church "and the true religion must endure as long as the world. This "is a stern necessity, for a road to heaven must be open "to all men at all times. False religions, on the other hand, "are liable to fluctuate and change. But all writers and all "histories proclaim with one concerted voice that the Papal "Church is the most ancient, that Christ and the Apostles are "its source and origin, and that it has been perpetuated in "a regular order and succession."[75] Luther says it is enough to make one shriek with fright and stand on one's head, to hear the Pope and his minions boasting that they are the Christian Church. And he describes them as mounting the rostrum and ranting: "Here's Peter's bark; the blind surging "waves may toss it to and fro, but it shall never sink. We "are God's true people, the Christian Church. And, pray, "who are you?"[76] In rebutting this charge, Luther executed several changes of front; at times he contended that the Apostolic Church was invisible; at other times he championed Holy Scripture as the Apostolic message; sometimes, again,

74 *De Util. cred.* ix. 21.

75 J. Niemöller, *Flacius und Flacianismus.* Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie, 1888, p. 81.

76 *Werke*, herausgegeben von Walch, vii. 2501. See Döllinger, *Die Reformation* 1848, iii. 202. *Kirche und Kirchen*, p. 493. Bellarmine, *l.c.* 4. 9.

he appealed to the Fathers, but more frequently to his own vocation to preach the pure Gospel, and denounced the Catholic Church for falling away from the Gospel.

The Reformers and their followers imagined that God had withdrawn from the Church soon after the death of the Apostles, and left it a prey to Satan, who had taken over the office which, according to the Gospel promises, belonged to the Holy Ghost. And thus Satan had set up a kind of diabolical millenium which lasted until the star of Luther arose. The "papistical Church" was commonly set down as the synagogue of Antichrist, as a theatre of ignorance and vice, and as a "perfect bedlam." This Protestant notion of the Church, as a huge imposture, conducted by knaves and hypocrites at the expense of the deluded masses, is alleged by Frederic II. as his main reason for despising Christianity altogether.

But soon the weakness of the position began to be keenly felt. It was perceived that to snap asunder all historical continuity with the Church Apostolic was to play with edged tools, therefore Flaccius set to work to prove the antiquity of Protestantism by compiling his *Catalogus testium veritatis.* The Madgeburg Centuriators, who grew up under his tuition, had the same end in view. Their witnesses are the so-called forerunners of the Reformation, among whom Waldus, Wiclif, Hus and Savonarola hold a conspicuous place. And they have essayed, too, to fetch thin echoes from the Fathers. As if these were entitled to rank among the pioneers of Protestantism because they "protest against superstition, sanctification "by works, creature-worship, ecclesiastical priggishness, and "alienation." The Fathers from the first hold fast to the idea of the Church. A few isolated snippings from here and there may forge a difficulty, but cannot make a real difference as to the main point.

Nor do "Ullmann's Legends" about the pre-reformation reformers answer their purpose, as even Protestant historians

consider them exploded. In Wiclif and Huss, "who looked "down from the vantage-ground of mediæval religious ideas, "not a speck of genuine evangelical piety can be detected." Savonarola is the principal representative of beggar-monks,— "a thoroughly mediæval institution." "A settled conviction, "a concrete picture varied in form and quivering with life, has "replaced Ullmann and Bonnechose's pale and shadowy "spectres—a conviction which establishes Luther's wonderful "*originality* in developing and discovering new religious ideas, "and in carrying out the steps that led up to them."[77] The Reformers, therefore, were bent, not on restoring the Apostolic Church and doctrine, but on producing a "brand new form of Christianity," in other words, on "unfurling the standard of "democracy against an aristocratic priesthood."[78] But the old forms were as far as possible retained, so that the design might be kept secret from the people.[79]

Nevertheless those who, like the many American sects, glory in turning their back on the past, and in despising a tradition in proportion to its antiquity, are comparatively few.[80] Rather, enlightened Protestants have ever re-echoed the Catholic principle found in the Fathers. On it Kepler based his opposition to the *Formula Concordiae* and prepared to be excommunicated rather than forgo it. The acceptance of the article of faith: "we believe in One, Holy, Catholic and "Apostolic Church" and "in one baptism for the remission of "sins" must gradually entail a profession in the principle of historical continuity between the early centuries of Christianity and those which follow. It will show, moreover, where we are to look for the "source and standard of Christian truth, "and also for the established means of grace."[81]

77 Lobstein, *Theol. Liter Zeitung* 1887. Nr. 26. Müller, *Bericht über den gegenwärt. Stand der Forschung auf dem Gebiete der vorreformat. Zeit.* Giessen 1887. But see also Hase, p. 80

78 Hase, p. 296.

79 Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen*, p. 438.

80 Döllinger, *l.c* p. 331.

81 Scheele, in Zöckler, ii. 395.

Important historical investigations have convinced such Protestant historians, as have succeeded in weaning themselves from traditional prejudices, that religious life in the middle ages developed, on the whole, in a notably ascending scale. "The period immediately preceding the Reformation was "marked by a flexibility and deep and far-reaching movement "in religion, which were the outcome of an inward piety and "of religious motives that had been deeply instilled into the "hearts of the people. The religious current began in the "upper classes and moved in a downward direction into the "masses of the people, whereas, in the history of the Church "till the fourth century, it evidently took the opposite course."[82]

31.* The *British* and *Northern* churches were more conservative than other Protestant communities. They retained the episcopal system, and considered episcopal succession as essential to the Christian Church. But what kind of a succession is necessary and essential to the Catholic Church? Does succession simply consist in valid orders, no matter how, or by whom conferred? Can there be no usurping bishops? Surely succession, in the real and proper sense, implies legitimate mission to the office of a bishop. Thus it also implies that each bishop was in communion with his predecessor, and so on up to the time of the Apostles. Not every sort of successor will suffice. But succession must be *Apostolic*, i.e., a man must be a bishop by the will and favour of some Apostolic see. Only in this way can the Apostles be said to live in their successors. It is precisely by receiving this mission and commission from an Apostolic See that the genuine successor is distinguished from the usurping bishop. Moreover, what is the purpose and reason of the Apostolic Episcopal succession? Is it not to maintain the Apostolic doctrine and the true means of grace? But if this be so, then the Episcopal body existing previous to the Reformation was the infallible guardian of the Apostolic doctrines and means of

82 Loofs, *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1887. Nr. 8.

grace. Now if they held the position of infallible guardian, there could be no ground whatever for schism and separation. If, however, they did not, of what use is Episcopacy, and why trouble about Episcopal succession? The Episcopal system, maintained in the interest of the principle of Apostolic succession, becomes absolutely illogical in any other but the Catholic Church. Valid Episcopal orders are necessary, indeed, for the successors of the Apostles; they are a *conditio sine qua non;* where they fail, there can be no Church whatever.[83] But they alone are not sufficient. They must also be *received* and *exercised* by the permission and commission of an Apostle; in other words, a successor in the real sense of the word must have *missio Apostolica.*

We, therefore, conclude that the Episcopal system in the Anglican and Northern churches, is a mere external framework, a dead outward symbol of a reality that ought to be, but is not; and their testimony to the necessity of Apostolicity tells really in favour of Rome.*

83 Möhler, *Patrologie* p. 350.

* The question of the Apostolic character of the Anglican Church has recently been much discussed under the name and form of *continuity.* Books have been written, sermons preached, lectures given, up and down the country, with a view to establishing the continuity of the Church of England. But readers will search in vain in any one of them for a definition or explanation of the meaning of the word. To judge from the proofs brought forward, the continuity consists in the fact that there has been from the earliest times a Christian religion in the country; or, that there has been uninterruptedly for centuries a church consisting of bishops, priests, deacons, and people. From this it is concluded that there is continuity in the Church of England. The sophism is too glaring to be hid. This kind of continuity is established by *abstract* thought; it is continuity of the most generic kind, far removed from the real and specific continuity proper to an *individual living organism* such as the Church must be, if it is the Church at all. The proof would be more to the point, if it were thus conceived: The Christian Church of England has been, ever since its existence, in communication with a Church that is *evidently Apostolic;* or, in a milder form, has ever been in communion with the Churches spread over the world, that have been universally considered as portions of the Catholic Church; or, again, has ever been in communion with its own self i.e., its predecessor! But this proof is not even attempted. Continuity, in this question, *must* mean identity, not similarity; identity not of place, but of self, of personal self, that is, it must be identical in body, soul, mind and heart. There must be identically the same organic constitution, the same organic connection, the same doctrines, the same moral and religious observances. This is real continuity. Tr.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH ONE.

1. Love unites, selfishness divides. It was the all-wise Creator's will that the human race, sprung from one pair, should form one great family which, by being united to God and among themselves in charity and holiness, should establish God's kingdom on earth and bring all men to eternal happiness in union with God, their Father and Creator. But man's selfishness and the devil's malice have willed and wrought otherwise. By hearkening to the suggestions of their enemy, and by giving way to selfishness and pride, our first parents ruthlessly snapped asunder the bond that linked the Creator with the creature.

The consequences could not be stayed. An evil deed is evil seed. It can beget naught but evil results. That is its curse, as the poet says.* The first two brothers, Abel and Cain, are a standing warning against the evil consequences of jealousy. Even the Deluge could not quench man's selfish views and aims. Again men rose up against God. Again they lost the tie that united them,—a common knowledge and worship of God; and with it they lost their common speech. While they were thinking, in the pride of their hearts, to erect an everlasting monument to glorify themselves by building the Tower of Babel, and thus as it were hurling defiance at the Almighty, God came down from heaven, looked at their work,

* "Das is der Fluch der bösen That."

and threw their speech into confusion, so that no man could understand his neighbour. "And so the Lord scattered them "from that place into all lands." In belief and thought, in life and action as well as in speech, they were divided and split up into hostile races, peoples and nations, and scattered abroad over all lands.

2. Nay more, Religion itself, which should have united men with the one God and with one another, became a new source of dissension, that created a still wider breach between peoples and cities. "To which of the gods," asks S. Athanasius, "shall we turn, in order to pray to God with confidence, or to "stand firm in the knowledge of God. For all men have not "the same gods; there are as many gods as peoples. Nay the "same country, or even the same town often has different gods. The Phoenicians certainly do not acknowledge the Egyptian "gods, nor the Egyptians those of Phoenicia, nor do the "Scythians worship those of the Persians, nor the Persians "those of Scythia. The Pelasgians reject the gods of Thrace, "and the Thracians ignore the Theban. The Indians are "opposed to the Arabians, and the Arabian to the Ethiopian. "And so it is with Syria, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Bithynia and "Armenia. Each differs from the other. The dwellers on the "Continent differ from those of the Islands. In short, every "city and every hamlet, ignoring the gods of its neighbours, "prefers its own and thinks that they alone are gods. Not to "speak of the abominable ceremonies of the Egyptians, which, "as every one knows, are most contrary and opposed to one "another. . . . In brief, all idolatrous nations wholly "differ in their religion and belief; and it was meet that this "should befall them. For, having fallen away from the "knowledge of *the one God*, they rushed headlong into a "variety of errors; and when they went astray from the true "Word (Logos) of the Father, their mind was justly carried "about by every wind of doctrine. As they who turn away "from the sun, find themselves groping about in the dark,

"unable to see things that are present, but imagine that they "see things that are not, so, in like manner, men who have lost "sight of God are struck blind; and being tossed about by "their own passions, they become the prey of their wild and "deranged imaginations."[1]

3. And yet God did not forsake the work of His hands. The more man severed himself from God, the more steadily God was laying out plans for future reunion. First and foremost He established a covenant with His people in the Old Testament. The new race was to spring from Abraham, and fill the earth. And God appointed circumcision as an outward symbol of this covenant, and as a pledge that all who were marked by it belonged to God's one people. And unity was knitted in still closer bonds by the legislation given through Moses. God's unity was the model for the unity of the chosen people; and the rays of political and religious unity converged in one visible centre—the Ark of the Covenant and the Temple at Jerusalem.

4. Outside Israel, too, and owing to its influence, preparations were gradually being made for reuniting the peoples of the world. The Greeks supplied the language, and the Roman Empire the idea. The idea of a universal monarchy, which had been the dream of Alexander the Great, was carried into effect by the keen practical sense, iron inflexibility, and tenacious purpose of the Romans. And they shrewdly pressed Religion into their service, not by trampling on the gods of the vanquished, but by enthroning them in their Pantheon. "The "Romans honour all divinities," says Cæcilius in the Dialogue of Minucius Felix,[2] and he proceeds to descant on the blessings that accrue to the Romans from this practice· "Thus "the Romans have made the whole world their footstool, and "extended their dominion to the path of the sun and the "bounds of the ocean, by being god-fearing and virtuous in the

1 *Contra Gentes*. c. 23.
2 *Octav*. c. 6. 25. See Arnob. *c. Gent*. vi.

"country; by fortifying a town with holy sacrifices, and chaste "virgins, and with many priestly honours and dignities . . . "by honouring the gods of the vanquished, giving them hospi-"tality, and making them their own; and finally by erecting "altars to unknown gods and infernal powers." Later on, however, Felix discounts his praise, and tears down the mask of Roman hypocrisy. Thus, then, did God, by His universal Providence, and by Revelation, prepare the way for the worship of the one true God in a community spread all over the earth.

5. This, too, was the burden of the prophecies concerning the Messianic Kingdom. A kingdom of righteousness, of peace, and happiness, was the noble vision in which the Messianic hopes of Israel centred. Strifes and disputes are extinguished, and enemities have vanished like smoke. The Assyrian and the Egyptian shall be united with Israel as one great confederacy (Isaias XIX), and Israel and Juda shall no more make war on one another. "And the envy of Ephraim "shall be taken away. . . . Ephraim shall not envy Juda, "and Juda shall not fight against Ephraim." (Isaias XI. 13.) "And the children of Juda and the children of Israel shall be "gathered together, and they shall appoint themselves one "head.[3] Everywhere, indeed, the imagery is borrowed from the old Israel, the land of Canaan, but behind the forms of the imagery there appears the new Israel, glimmering with streaks of light from the Messianic Kingdom which, heretofore divided, shall be united by a king from David's royal house. "And "they shall walk in my judgments, and shall keep my com-"mandments. . . ." "They shall be of one heart and one "mind. And I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for "ever." (Ezech. XXXVII. 26.) "And the Lord shall be king "over all the earth. In that day there shall be one Lord, and "His name shall be one." (Zach. XIV. 9).

6. These promises were fulfilled in Christianity, which is the final and absolute revelation. And as the absolute revela-

3 Os. i. 11. Ezech. xxxvii. 22, 24. See Jerem. iii. 18; xxx. 4. 9. Selbst, p. 245.

tion is one, so also the Messianic Kingdom is one. Truth is one, but falsehood and error are manifold. The kingdom of truth, the kingdom of God, the Church must be one. This truth, as we have seen, is so clearly and distinctly set forth in Holy Scripture, that about the proposition itself there can be no doubt. There is *one* Shepherd and *one* flock, *one* door, and *one* sheepfold, *one* Father of all believers, present and future. There is *one* God, *one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism. The Church is a great body, with Christ as its head; the bride that Christ has prepared for Himself; the house of God; the dwelling-place of the Lord. Only those who are members of the one body can be united with Christ. The unity of the Church goes hand in hand with the unity of Christ. As He is one individual being, so is the Church. In technical language, hers is a *formal* unity. She is *una* and *unica*. This unity is at once a necessary property and a mark of the Church. And it is easy to see from Scripture why this unity must be set down as a mark of the true Church. For it *manifests* itself in unity of faith and doctrine (Creed), in the unity of the means of grace and worship (Liturgy), and in the unity of idea and government (Hierarchy) which is indissolubly bound up with these. All these factors revealed themselves at the very beginning in the Apostolic Church. For Jews and Gentiles, under the guidance of the Apostles, were united in a brotherhood of faith and charity, and were preserved in the unity of Confession and a common worship of God.

8. The first Pentecost is the first feast of the Church's dedication. As a new creation the Church is the antitype of the first creation from chaos, as well as the direct antithesis to the confusion of tongues created at Babel. As the Spirit once moved over the waters to divide the chaos and evolve structures of light, so the Spirit of God moved over the Apostles and the faithful to arm them with power from above for the new creation in Christ. The work of the spirit of charity and truth can only tend to unite and to sanctify. This effect

was seen in a wonderful manner in the gift of tongues, for it was a sign that the Spirit who had once thrown speech into confusion was now knitting hearts together with an indissoluble bond. All that heard were amazed at hearing, every man in his own tongue, what the Galileans spake. "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and inhabitants of "Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, "Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya about "Cyrene, and strangers of Rome; Jews also and proselytes, "Cretes and Arabians—we have heard them speak in our own "tongue the wonderful works of God." (Acts II. 7-11).

9. But it was necessary that this inward union in one faith, that had been effected under outward visible signs, should also be externally expressed and always be recognizable. This was the work of baptism, the sacrament and seal of faith. Baptism is a condition of admission into the kingdom of God, and the one baptism is a mark of the one Church. Josephus, as we have seen, regarded the baptism of John in the same light And S. Augustine says: "There can be no religious "society, whether the religion be true or false, without some "sacrament or visible symbol to serve as a bond of union. "The importance of these sacraments cannot be overstated, "and only scoffers will treat them lightly."[4]

In addition to baptism there was also the Eucharist (breaking of bread) which was likewise a symbol of brotherhood. The bread that Jesus blessed at the last supper was *one*, and the chalice that He consecrated and gave to all to drink was also *one*. The chalice of benediction is the communion of the blood of Christ. And the bread which we break is the partaking of the body of Christ. "For we, being many, "are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread." (I Cor. x. 16. 17).

10. Again, the Spirit was working by means of the Apostles,

4 *Contra Faust.* xix. 11. Clark's (Trl.) Bonav. *Sentent.* iv. d. i. a. 1. q. 2. See Kellner, *apud* Kraus, *Real-Enc.* ii. 704.

whose duty and office it was to promote the work of unity. S Paul extols the Gospel above Judaism, because it tore down the wall of separation that had hitherto divided the Jews from the unclean Gentiles. "The mystery of Christ which in other "generations was not known to the sons of men, as it is now "revealed to His holy angels and prophets in the Spirit. That "the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body "and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus by the "Gospel." (Ephes iii. 5. 6). There is no longer Greek nor barbarian, master nor slave, man nor woman, for all are equal in Christ and His Church. "Christ is our peace, who hath "made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of "partition, the enmities in this flesh, making void the law of "commandments contained in decrees; that he might make "the two in himself into one new man, making peace, and "might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing "the enmities in himself. For by Him we have access both in "one spirit to the Father." (Ephes. ii. 14-18). And therefore the Apostle exhorts the Ephesians to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. "One body, one spirit, as you "are called in one hope of your calling" Dissensions and strifes should have no place in churches that are united in the same faith and charity. With a sorrowful and aching heart the Apostle learnt that schisms had arisen at Corinth. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul then crucified for you? or "were you baptized in the name of Paul?" (I Cor. i. 13). "For "God is not the God of dissension but of peace." (xiv. 33).

With still greater earnestness the Apostles raise a note of alarm against heresies, which rend asunder the unity of faith. As our Lord once warned them against false prophets in sheep's clothing (Matth. viii. 15) so, as a parting request, Paul urged the bishops of Ephesus to protect the flock of Christ against ravening wolves, who would not spare the flock. In the pastoral Epistles his chief concern is to impress on his disciples to redouble their watchfulness against false teachers. For

"the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall "depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and "doctrines of devils." (I Tim. iv. 1). "Shun profane and "vain babblings; for they grow much towards ungodliness; "and their speech spreadeth like a canker." (II Tim. ii. 17). And S. John, who saw the weeds springing up, laments that antichrists lead the faithful astray from Christ. "They went "out from us, but they are not of us. For if they had been of "us, they would no doubt have remained with us; but that "they may be manifest, that they are not all of us." (I John ii. 19). S. Peter, too, lifts up his voice against lying teachers who, like the false prophets of the New Testament, "shall "bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought "them." (II Peter ii. 1).

Whether we take the word "heresy" in its proper sense, as something special, the sect, the school, or in its derivative sense as erroneous doctrine, it is clear that the Apostles were cautioning the community against those who preached any doctrine other than that of Christ and the Apostles. For there is no wisdom besides the one truth, and no living heavenly Church but the one body of Christ in charity and holiness. And if the schismatic sins against charity, the heretic sins against both faith and charity.

11. From what has been already said about the Church it follows that this unity of faith and charity is not confined to the several communities amongst themselves, but that it stretches over the whole Church. Everywhere the same Gospel was preached, the same sacraments administered, the same mysteries celebrated, the same disciplinary regulations enacted. In order to establish and to safeguard unity with the first Apostles, S. Paul journeyed repeatedly to Jerusalem. And if the inner motive of this unity was belief in God, the Father of all, in Christ, the Redeemer of all, and in the Holy Spirit, who pours forth grace and charity in all, so its external motive was that union of the Apostles amongst themselves which guarantees

that the Church will be governed on the harmonious basis of unity in belief and sacraments. The collections made by the Gentile Christians for the poor in Jerusalem, were a touching testimony and tribute to the brotherly love and unity that prevailed among Jews and Gentiles. When discord broke out at Antioch, the Church sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, that, in union with the Apostles and ancients and the whole Church, they might put an end to the dispute. The Apostolic Council was representative of the whole Church, and drew up four decress for regulating the ordinary relations of life among Jews and Gentiles.

12. The post-Apostolic Church, and above all others the Roman Church, has given full expression to her faith in the unity of the Apostolate, by her constant use of the baptismal confession of faith, called, for that reason, the Apostles' Creed, the twelve articles of which embody for all time the unity of the Apostolic faith. As we have already pointed out, the agreement upon this epitome of Christian belief, was not the result of the heresies of the second and third centuries ;[5] it existed long before. The ancient Roman Symbol goes back to the days of S. John, or may be, even to the latter half of the Pauline Era. It was foreshadowed in Matth. XXVIII. 19, and it became indispensable alike for Baptism and the instruction of the people. All who profess the symbol profess substantially the faith of the Apostles, and thereby confess that they belong to the one Apostolic Church. "To make war upon the Apostles' "Creed is to attack the kingdom built on the foundation of the "Apostles. Not a stone can be displaced without imperilling "the entire structure. Pithy in wording, and imposing in its "grandeur, this symbol has ever been the bond of union among "all Christians, as it symbolises the one baptism of Christen"dom."[6]

5 Hase, *Polemik*, p. 11.

6. Scheele (Caspari), *ap.* Zöckler, II 393. For further details on the *symbolum Apostolicum*, see Probst, *Lehre and Gebet*, p. 41.

13. This Symbol of faith, however, could not, in itself, have been a bond of union. It had this effect only in so far as it was the profession of faith of a visible community, the Church. As it is based on a tradition emanating from the Apostles, so it must be proclaimed and preserved by the Church-organs appointed by the Apostles, who were to be at the same time the dispensers of its Sacraments. Without Apostles there would be no Apostles' Creed; without the successors of the Apostles we could have no guarantee that it represents the faith of the Apostles. As S. Irenæus says: "As I have already "observed, the Church, having received this preaching and "this faith, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet, "as if occupying but one house, carefully preserves it. She "also believes these points (of doctrine) just as if she had but "one soul, and one and the same heart, and she proclaims and "teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, "as if she possessed only one mouth. For, although the lan-"guages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the "traditions is one and the same. For the churches which have "been planted in Germany do not believe or hand down any-"thing different, nor do those in Spain, nor those in Gaul, nor "those in the East, nor those in Libya, nor those which have "been established in the central regions of the world. But as "the sun, that creature of God, is one and the same throughout "the whole world, so also the preaching of the truth shineth "everywhere, and enlightens all men that are willing to come "to a knowledge of the truth. Nor will any one of the rulers "in the churches, however highly gifted he may be in point "of eloquence, teach doctrines different from these (for no "one is greater than the master); nor, on the other hand, "will he who is deficient in power of expression, inflict injury "on the tradition."[7]

It is the Apostolic spirit, the spirit of Christ in the Church, that has made the symbol into a principle of union. It has

7 I. 10, 3. (Clark's Tr.)

been called a veritable "bulwark erected from the beginning "by the Spirit of God, who is a living power in the Church, "to drive off such flighty birds of prey as the Gnostics, and "also such creeping vermin as the Ebionites."[8] But this implies that the same Spirit must continue to work in the Church in order to make this symbol an efficient vehicle of faith. The darts of heresy would not rebound harmlessly from a symbol that had not grown into and out of a living organism. A shield avails but little, unless it be held by a warrior. Heretics feared neither Gospel nor symbol; the successors of the Apostles alone were able to put them to flight. And when we stand rapt in wonder at the marvellous energy displayed by the Church in the second century, in the face of heathen brute force and heretical craft and duplicity, we should not forget that such power could be developed only in a compactly organized Church, whose irresistible might lay in the Apostolic succession. It was not the creed which made the Church or her unity, but it was the Church equipped with creed, authority and sacraments that established unity in faith and discipline, and saved Christendom from being splintered into countless Christian and unchristian sects. "An empirical (visible) "society cannot be governed by a word, whether written or "traditional, but only by men; for the letter will always divide "and part asunder."[9]

14. This fact did not escape the keen eyes of those who were bent on destroying the Christian faith. The Church was the enemy. The first thing was to batter down her organization, her organic unity. Julian, the apostate foe of Christianity, allowed Donatus' party a free hand to corrupt; he gave back the basilicas to heretics, when re-opening the temples to demons; thinking to blot out Christianity from the face of the earth, by making war on its unity, and putting a premium on schism.[10]

8 Scheele *l. c.* p. 394.

9 Harnack, p. 309. Döllinger, *l. c.* xxiii. p. 23.

10 *Ep.* 105, 2. 9. *Sermo ad Caes.* pleb. n. 5. *De Unit. Eccl.* ii. 2.

And here it was made plain to demonstration how little a mere formula of faith, even when joined with baptism, can accomplish towards welding men into unity. Augustine, while recognizing that the Donatists had both, deplored their want of unity and charity. Without these the formula of faith is a pennon flying in the air, not a firmly planted standard round which the soldier of Christ can rally. None can have this charity, save those who pray in unison to the Father in heaven. And if we pray to one Father, why should we not acknowledge that we have one mother? Let us hold fast to that which is indivisible.

15. Hence the Fathers of the second century, not without reason, dovetailed the proof for the Church's unity into the proof for Apostolicity. Bishops, in their eyes, are the custodians of ecclesiastical unity, both in their several churches and in the Church at large. Clement warned the Corinthians against schism by appealing to the Apostles. Ignatius is most emphatic in exacting that the unity of the Church should be both internal [as in Christ] and external, both ideal and real. He regards it as internally connected with the Incarnation and the Eucharist. As God the Son appeared on earth as a perfect man in order to make men the Sons of God, so the faithful must be united with Christ both outwardly and inwardly, in the spirit and in the flesh, if they are to share in His graces. They must believe in his divinity and humanity, in the whole Christ, and unite themselves to Him in the Eucharist. That inward organic unity, which is vividly described in the similes under which the Church is pourtrayed[11] (e.g., kingdom of God, house of the Father, living temple of God, body of Christ) is necessary indeed, but cannot subsist without external unity. Rather the faithful are bidden to be all one heart, one body, to eschew all parties and divisions, so that when they meet together to worship God, it may be "one prayer, one petition, one heart, one hope and

11 *Ad Ephes.* c. 5. *Ad Magn.* c. 1.

"charity and unsullied joy." "Brethren, be not deceived; "if a man associate with a schismatic, he has no part in the "kingdom of God; and if he walk in any other opinion, he "is excluded from benefitting by the sufferings of Christ."

Such ecclesiastical unity, however, can only be bought by obedience to the bishop, in the same way as Christ, according to the flesh, was obedient to His Father, and the Apostles were obedient to Christ, and the Father, and the Spirit; "so "that unity may be corporal as well as spiritual."[12] The bishop is the depositary of unity in the community, and the body of bishops in the Church at large. He who is in union with the bishop, is a child of the Church of God. Without bishop, priest and deacon, who bring the people together to serve God in common, Ignatius is perfectly at a loss to conceive a Church. "Bestir yourselves, therefore, to receive "one Eucharist. For there is only one flesh of our Lord Jesus "Christ; one chalice whereby we are united with his blood; "and one altar of sacrifice; just as there is but one bishop, "with priests and deacons, my fellow servants; so that what "ye do, you may do in God."[13]

He who is at one with the bishop, is in union with the whole Church, which is Christ's body. And as each bishop is the visible head of his own Church, so Christ is the invisible head of the whole Church. He who partakes of the Eucharist consecrated by the bishop, partakes of the life of grace that courses through the body of Christ. And as Christ, at His last supper, commanded the Apostles to do what He had done, so it is by them and their successors that communication with Christ and His Church is maintained and nourished. As the God-man died for all men, so His Church must contain in a visible and spiritual unity all men of good will. "Where "the bishop is, there also should be the people, just as the "Catholic Church is, where Jesus Christ is." In like manner,

12 *Ad Philad.* c. 3. *Magn.* c. 6. *Ephes.* c. 16.
13 *Ad Trall.* c. 3. *Philad.* c. 4. Cf. *Smyrn.* c. 8. 2. *Martyr. Polyc.* 16. 2; 19. 2.

the author of the *Martyrium S. Polycarpi*, while styling Polycarp bishop of the Catholic Church at Smyrna, declares that above him is "our Lord Jesus Christ, the "Saviour of our souls and the Shepherd of the Catholic "Church spread all over the world." And as the Church at Smyrna was certainly real and visible, so certain is it that Ignatius and the author of the *Martyrium* must also have had in mind a real and visible Church, extending all over the world, the unity of which was both symbolized and caused by the unity of the Catholic bishops.

16. Hegesippus, who was the first to attempt a dogmatic and historical proof for the unity of the whole Church, states, as the result of his travels and enquiries, that the bishops of the different Churches profess one and the same Apostolic faith, which they had inherited in unbroken succession from the Apostles, "in each succession of "bishops, and in each town, that endures which the Law "and the prophets and the Lord enjoin."[14] While stating that heresies arose after the first Apostolic generation had passed away, he gives his idea of the Church. "Hence "they called the Church a virgin, because she had not yet "been contaminated by foolish words [doctrines]." Heretics were the first to "rend the Church's unity by teach-"ing corrupt doctrines about God and His Christ." Unity is only to be found with the bishops. Let any one question them all, and he will find that they all agree.

And even if some Fathers do not speak in so many words of the hierarchical constitution of the Church, there is nothing to show that they had any doubt about it. On the contrary, it is implied in the Church's compact membership and common worship. This is clear from the fact that later Fathers, *Ambrose* for instance, whose minds were never crossed by a doubt about Episcopal unity, lay special stress on unity in faith and charity. *Justin* says that the believers are one soul, one community, one

14 Euseb iv. 30. 2.

Church, because they form one body. *Hermas* likens the Church to a tower, the stones of which are so closely fitted one into the other, that it seems to be a monolith. For the faithful that have been admitted into the Church dwell together in the most complete unity; they form one body with one spirit, one mind, one faith, one charity. All stones in the tower shine with equal brilliancy.[15] But this can only be when all are illumined by the same faith and set on fire by the same charity. Still each stone in the tower occupies the position that suits it. For this reason other Fathers give prominence to the other side of the building, and exhibit the diversity in unity, viewing organization as the ground-work. "One Church, over the whole world, is divided "into many members, and the rays of one Episcopate are "scattered in harmony among many bishops." The Catholic "Church is one, knitted together by the bond of priests "(Bishops), says S. *Cyprian*.[16]

17. Heresies also bear testimony to this two-fold unity of the Church,—unity in faith and in the Episcopate. They are more recent than the Church, and the brand of error and innovation is stamped on their brow; for antiquity and apostolic succession are marks of the true Church.[17] Whence came they? They went forth from the one Church, the one tree which Christ planted. They are as branches dropped off and withered. They are brooks diverted from the one source of living water, and running along the sands. Could we wish for better witnesses to the Church's original unity?[18] If Novatian has cut himself adrift from the Church, this one fact debars men from any longer listening to his teaching. "Whoever he may be, he "is not Christ if he be not in Christ's Church." "If there "were no Church in Donatus' time, whence came he? From "what sea did he emerge? From what heaven did he drop?"[19]

15 Justin., *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 63. 42. Herm., *Visio* iii. c. 2. 5. *Simil.* ix. 15. 18.
16 Epist. 52, 24; 69, 8. See Schwane, II. 32.
17 See Bellarm. Tom. II. l. ii. 4, 2. Tournely, p. 34.
18 Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 17. Aug., *Sermo* 46, 8, 18. *Epist.* 44.
19. Cypr. Ep. 55, 24. Aug., *De Bapt. c. Don.* 3, 2. *Contra Cresc.* 2, 33.

And they are in this sorry plight, not merely because they have fallen away from the Church, but also because on their side they are ever at variance one with another, and are utterly incompetent to preserve unity even in a narrow sphere.

The multitude of heresies, each arrogating to itself the name Christian, often gave a handle to Jews and pagans to point the finger of scorn at Christ, and deterred those who were on the road to conversion from taking the step. Celsus twitted Christians with being divided into innumerable sects. To this taunt the Fathers made a twofold reply. They represented schism, which the Apostles had foreseen and foretold, as natural, and at the same time salutary for the body of the Church; and they proved that the errors and discussion rife among heretics were the consequence of their apostasy. The many sects supply a proof for the true Church, for the Apostle says: *Oportet hæreses esse:* there must needs be heresies.[20] And they also prognosticate that the end of the world is near, for Christ said that these things must then come to pass. Philosophers and physicians were divided into different schools; and yet philosophy and medicine did not cease to be regarded as sciences, but rather a spurt was given to them. So, in like manner, the Church does not cease to be true because heretics have revolted, but she triumphs over all. For, says S. Hilary, "all, indeed, array them-"selves in hostility to the Church, but as all heretics fly at "one another's throats, they derive no benefit from their "victory. For by their victory the Church triumphs over "all, because one heresy contends against another for "what the faith of the Church condemns.[21] And what has been, still is. The Church is represented with every possible and impossible error: with Rationalism, Pelagianism, with the teaching of Sanctification by works, with Laxity, with Rigorism and Mysticism. All this only goes to show that

20 I Cor. xi. 18. 19. II Tim. iii. 1–9. Just. *Dialog.* c. 35. Tertull. *De Praescr.* c. 4. Hom. Clem. 16, 21. Cypr. *De Unit.* c. 10. 16. Aug. *Ep.* 185. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 15. Orig. *c. Cels.* iii. 12; v. 62. See Möhler, *Patrol.* p. 457.

21 *De Trin.* vii. 4. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 16.

the Church posesses the one undivided truth, of which the sects and philosophic schools have, by whim and caprice, elected to retain a few fragments. Weeds grow up among the garden plants; but the gardener therefore does not cease to tend and cultivate his garden. The king's highway is safe; other roads and byeways lead to error. "And therefore we "maintain that the ancient Catholic Church is in itself one, "both in being and conception, in origin and in rank."[22]

Heresies must ever grow in number, and be riven more and more asunder into sects, in order to set their antagonism to the one true Church in a clearer light. And as they arbitrarily seceded from their one mother, and called themselves after their founders, and thereby proclaimed that they differed from the whole Christian Church,[23] so, again, their followers go still further apart; for where authority is wanting, an arbitrary principle impels to division and dissolution. "What is allow- "able to Valentinus, is allowable also to his followers; and the "Marcionites claim the same privilege."[24] The evil one who invented heresies and schisms, in order to entrap the unwary by the name of Christian, keeps ever alive the same spirit of division. Heretics scatter with the devil, because they gather not with us. They wait till the people are asleep and then sow their deadly poisons to reap a harvest of death. Heretics were invented to undermine the faith, to corrupt truth, and to cleave unity in twain. By this means the devil hoped to destroy the Church, as philosophy was destroyed through its many sects.[25] But the precise contrary happened, because a stronger than he came, and despoiled him of his armour. The more multiform heresy became, the more the one undivided truth gained in lustre,—that Catholic truth which they possess to whom our Lord said: "Thou art Peter, &c.;"

22 Clem. *l. c.* 17. Möhler, *l. c.* p. 458.

23. Just., *Dial.* c. 35. Iren. i. 23, 4. Athan., *Serm. I. c. Ar.* c. 1.

24 Tertull., *De Praescr.* c. 42. Cf. Tournely, p 51.

25. Aug., *De Civ.* xviii. 51. Cypr., *De Unit.* c. 3. *Ep.* 69, 8. Cf. *Ep.* 27. 43. 59. Ambrose, *Ep.* 14. 1. Aug. Sermo 14, 9. 7; 295, 4.

"Feed my sheep": "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."

18. With a view to making the proof still more complete, we will summarize S. *Cyprian's* argument for unity. For there can be no doubt that he has fully and entirely taught and explained the unity of the Catholic Church in doctrine, morals and discipline. Did he not expressly point to the unity of the Episcopate, and to the unity of the Church that springs from the union of the bishops with the Roman See? The Lord, he says, in order to manifest the beacon light of unity, set up one cathedra, and by his authority instituted the source of that unity, which begins with one. The other Apostles were also what Peter was, having a like partnership of honour and power; but the beginning goes forth from unity, and the primacy was given to Peter to show that there is one Church of Christ and one Cathedra. All are shepherds, and the flock to be fed by all the Apostles in harmony is indicated as one, to show that the Church of Christ is one. This unity we must uphold and defend with all our might and main, especially we bishops who hold the first places in the Church; so that the Episcopate may be shewn to be one and undivided. There is one Episcopate, in which all who are in union with the whole *(in solidum pars tenetur)* have a share. There is one Church which, by bearing fruit, becomes many.

As in the sun there are many rays but only one light; as the branches on the tree are many but the force is one, and they all spring from the root; as many brooklets flow from one source, and maintain unity in origin; so the light that streams from the Lord to the Church diffuses its rays all over the earth; and yet the light that is scattered everywhere is one, nor is the unity of the body divided. It spreads its branches over the whole earth owing to its richness and fertility, and cuts out wider channels for the brooklet; but the head, the origin, and the mother are one. The Church is never divided from Christ (John vi. 67), and the Church is formed by the

people in union with the bishop, and the flock in dependence on the shepherd. The bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop. He who is not with the bishop, neither is he in the Church. In vain those who are not at peace with the priests roam about, thinking they are secretly in fellowship; for the Church that is Catholic and one, is not divided, but most certainly united in the priests, who are built up into a unity.

Even when engaged in a brief but severe contest with the occupant of the Roman See, he would not separate from unity, but persevered in communion with those whom he was combating; for he was convinced that unity was the first and foremost point to be guarded. He who falls away from it, severs himself from truth and faith, and from Christ's body. S. Augustine thinks that great credit is due to S. Cyprian on this score, and he sees in it a reason for passing a more lenient judgment on his conduct in the controversy about heretical baptism. "For it is no small proof of a most peaceful soul, "that he won the crown of matyrdom in that unity from which "he would not separate, even though he differed from it. For "we are but men; and it is therefore a temptation incident "to men that we should hold views at variance with the truth "on any point. But to come through too great love of our "own opinion, or through jealousy of our betters, even to the "sacrilege of dividing the communion of the Church, and of "founding heresy or schism, is a presumption worthy of the "devil."[26] Even if history had not recorded the fact, we should have been perfectly convinced that the holy martyr shed his blood in the unity and peace of holy Church. For these words were often on his lips: "We have in all patience "and gentleness kept charity in heart, honour in discourse, the "bond of faith, and the unity of the priesthood." He gave a solemn assurance that he had not entered into dispute, in the interests of heretics, with his colleagues in the Episcopate,

26 *De Bapt. c. Donat.* ii 5. (Clark's Tr. B. II. chap. v. 6). Cypr. *Ep.* 70. 71. 73.

with whom he remains in the unity of God and the peace of the Lord.

19. The disputes in Africa were confined within a narrower range and had a still narrower influence. But the fundamental propositions by which they are tested contain all the elements in the idea of ecclesiastical unity. Cyprian and Augustine, like Tertullian before them, could never have gained such an easy victory over this faction, however little, if this idea had not been part and parcel of the Church since the days of the Apostles. Could it have been branded as a monstrosity that the whole Church should follow a clique in Africa, unless heretics had acknowledged the cohesion and unity of all churches? Still the Donatist schism was not too small to make itself felt far and wide in the African Church. About the year 300 A.D., two hundred and seventy schismatical bishops assembled in Synod. S. Augustine had still to bear the brunt of a severe and prolonged struggle with the Donatists, who only disappeared from Africa when Christianity itself, to the ruin of which they had largely contributed, began to disappear.

Nevertheless S. Augustine was never shaken in his faith. For he knew that the Church, as represented by the bishops, had existed long before the Donatists, and that as one Church it reached back to the Apostles. He who tears himself away from this unity forsakes Christ. They trust in God's promises who lean for support on him who sits in the Chair. For the whole Christian world, both on land and over the seas, and even the more important Churches in Africa are united with him. Nor was Augustine unaware that side by side with the orthodox Nicene Church the Arian had reared its crested head; that the Ebionite, Gnostic, Sabellian and Nestorian heresies were spreading alongside the true Church of the God-man. The world, as Jerome remarked on the Arian Synods, one morning awoke in astonishment at finding itself Arian. Thus Augustine had ample opportunity not only of detecting the poison that lay concealed in these heresies, but also of observing the feebleness and sterility of

the sects that had cast themselves off from the one Church. Although the German tribes first became acquainted with Christianity in its Arian form, they did not succeed in dragging the Western Church along with them, but were themselves gradually absorbed into its bosom. In the East the sects eked out a long and painful existence. But far from being an argument against the Church's unity, they are a terrible example of the chastisements that await those who forsake it. "One mother, pride, has begotten them, just as one "mother, the Catholic Church, begets all Christians scattered "over the world. It is, therefore, no wonder if pride begets "division, and love unity. The Church is like a vine spreading "its branches; the sects are like useless branches lopped "off by the pruner on account of their sterility, so that the vine "may be recognized, not that itself may be mutilated."[27]

S. Augustine wrote a short tractate on heresies, in which he marks the points of contrast between "Pride" and "Charity," in order to show Christians what they must guard against. He enumerated eighty-eight heresies. S. Jerome says: "The "welfare of the Church depends on the dignity of its chief "priest. Unless we see him to be invested with special and "extraordinary powers, there will be as many schisms in the "Church as there are priests." After the Council of Chalcedon, S. Leo wrote that it must now be as clear as daylight not only to the bishops but also to Christian princes and to clerics and laics of all grades, that the faith which he preached, as he received it, free from all contagion of error, and defended with the applause of the whole world, was the true Apostolic and Catholic faith; whereas those doctrines are blotted out from the face of the earth, which the early heretics or their successors with variegated mendacity, but with unvarying godlessness dared to forge.[28]

With the *later divisions* of the Church, however, the case

27 *Sermo* 46, 8, 18. *C. Epist. Parm.* i. 3.
28 Hieron. *Adv. Lucif.* n. 9. Leo M. *Epist.* 102. 2.

would seem to be different. The schism between East and West, whether we consider it in its nature, its causes, or its extent in time and space, seems to present special difficulties against the unity of the Church. Here it cannot be said that only a few twigs were lopped from the one great trunk. The trunk itself seemed to have split in twain. A great and lasting chasm opened between what had hitherto been two main portions of the Church. And this for causes so small and insignificant that one is amazed at the disproportion between cause and effect. Did not, asks Hase, difference of opinion and custom about a little leaven, suffice in the eleventh century, to separate *for ever* the Churches of East and West?[29] Still this gigantic and violent separation could not have been due to a difference in regard to leavened bread, which Rome, for the rest, recognized and allowed; nor, again, was it due to deeper dogmatic differences, such as the *Filioque*, and the doctrine concerning the dead and purgatory. The causes were far more political than religious. The *national antagonism* between New and Old Rome had by degrees become so pronounced, that the final breach was but a question of time. A few contentious and ambitious patriarchs were all that was required to accomplish it.

The repeated attempts at reunion, instructive as they otherwise are for our present question of unity, were foredoomed to failure, because being prompted merely by the needs of the hour, they could not allay the old national antipathy and jealousy. Eugenius IV., when he thought that the union, brought about by so much toil, was assured, sent forth a clear clarion sound of jubilation; but there was no echo in response. The pope showed how anxious the West were for re-union, although they were not in such immediate danger from the Turks as the Greeks were. A mother rejoices when the children that have gone astray return, just as the good shepherd carries the lost sheep on his shoulder back to the flock, and calls together his friends to rejoice (Luke xv. 6). But the Greek Church became

29 Hase, p. 11.

hardened in resentment. The Byzantines preferred to be Turks rather than Roman Catholics, and their wish was gratified. But what were the consequences and the costs of the separation? The Greek Church became more enslaved than ever. Stiff and lifeless it confined itself within its limits; and even within this narrow range it had all losses and no gains. The Russian Church split up into a multitude of sects, with Nihilism gnawing at its entrails; and it would long since have crumbled to pieces, had not the secular power held the heterogeneous elements together. These sects and separatist communities, moreover, cannot be combated and subdued by spiritual and ecclesiastical means; for the Russo-Greek Church has none such. There is neither preaching nor science, consequently, those many different sects constitute a grave danger to the State itself. Only a leader of ability is required to convert them into an engine of political revolution.[30] Are we wrong then in saying that the Greek Church has cut herself adrift from the living rock of unity, and been dashed to pieces? And yet the Greeks have an Episcopal organization and constitution, together with the sacramental means of grace. They have the framework of the Apostolate, without its life-giving spirit.*

21. The *Papal Schisms* in the twelfth, thirteenth, and

30 See Döllinger, *Kirche*, p. 5. 170. 185.

* The Greek Church, or rather Churches, believe, both theoretically and practically, in seven Sacraments. They have valid orders, that is, real bishops and priests Hence they can *validly* administer the Sacraments, though such administration is *illicit*, because in opposition to the Apostolic See. *Missio Apostolica*, which is something over and above valid orders, is absolutely essential for the legitimate dispensation of the means of grace which belong to the Apostolic Church, and to her alone. But the Sacrament of Penance forms an exception; it admits of no distinction between valid and licit administration, for the simple reason that it requires positive jurisdiction or judicial power which can only come from the Apostolic See. Those who are separated from the Apostolic See, by the very fact, lose all jurisdiction, and all claim to the *Missio Apostolica*. Hence it is impossible for them to administer the Sacrament of Penance validly. Only in *articulo mortis* can they do so, because in that case the Church supplies jurisdiction to all real priests.

It may be well to add a word on the subject of the Eastern schism in relation to Catholic unity. It is usual among a certain section of Englishmen to speak of a *divided* and an *undivided* Church. They mean to say that before the separation of East and West the Church was undivided, and one, but that since the separation

fourteenth centuries seriously imperilled for a time the Church's unity, and caused the faith of many to totter; but no one dreamed that the schism was to be permanent. All were agreed that there could be but one Church, one organic body, one head, and that the Bishop of Rome and he alone was the head of the Church. But there was a doubt and disagree ment as to who was the legitimate Bishop of Rome, and in what way the claims of the several competitors could be settled. When there were two or even three popes in the field, it is quite intelligible how well-meaning scholars came to hold the opinion that the General Council was above the pope. To them it seemed necessary that all other interests should be made subordinate to the highest possible end, viz., the peace and unity of the Church. The unity of the Church was now on its trial. But even the difficulties of this period were surmounted. The Church's unity withstood the severe test to which it was put in its visible head. And not only was its spiritual life uncrushed, but it soon welled forth again with fresh vigour and increased luxuriance.

22. There remains one more wound to probe, which is still smarting. We mean the divisions caused by the *Reformation* in the 16th century. A variety of circumstances in Church and State, in the scientific world and in society, had set a peculiar

she is divided and has consequently ceased to be one, and that she will not be one again, until these divisions have been healed by the reunion of Christendom. This reunion, they think, would consist in a compromise effected by men of wisdom and goodwill. As a matter of course, this view implies that the several separated communities are so many equal parts and portions of the one Church, from which they have been detached by sheer accident. But according to the Catholic, and we may say the rational view, the Church can never, at any time, be divided or cease to be one. To be divided would be to cease to exist altogether; for unity is as necessary to her as existence. Schisms will diminish her bulk and size but cannot impair her organism or any of its functions. The division therefore is purely material, not formal. The continuous existence of the one undivided Church is the necessary postulate both of schism and of reunion. Both would be inconceivable without it. The loss of the Eastern Church does not even amount to the loss of a limb in the natural body. For it does not constitute a mutilation of the Church, which, though smaller in bulk and size, remains whole and perfect and one for ever. The nearest and only approach to a divided Church is a Papal schism, in which there are apparently two complete organic bodies. If such a schism, with two doubtful Popes, were to become permanent, the unity of the Church would be destroyed. Tr.

stamp on the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries, and thus prepared the way for a revolution in ideas and things. A new era had dawned. And though the discovery of America and the sea route to East India opened out new fields for the Church's missionary energy, yet in her old domain she was sorely tried by the defection which issued in the Reformation. It seemed as if the one rock of Christ was to split at last. For the new learning, besides bringing into play various national, political, and social motives, constituted a complete breach, not merely with Church authority, but with the whole learning of the past. And still the Church has emerged from the ordeal, victorious. Her unity was saved, and even strengthened and consolidated. Christians severed from the Church by the Eastern Schism and the Reformation are, it is true, nearly as numerous as Catholics; but he who runs may easily see where stands the seat of unity of doctrine, discipline, worship and government. In recent times this unity is asserting itself in a marked manner. From the very first, other confessions have only been united negatively, that is by a common hatred and antagonism to Rome and every thing Catholic. Beyond this they have had no inner or outer bond of unity. Neither have they the means to resist further disintegration. Luther complained of the universal dismemberment and dissolution. Subsequently there was a veritable plague of sects. Nowadays it is barely possible to catalogue all denominations.[31]

The unity that has ever been so highly prized in Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers can even now be found nowhere but in the Catholic Church. Despite the assaults of science and social ravages she, and she alone, has shewn herself a match for all, and kept her phalanx solid and unbroken. The unity of all mankind is now the dream and ideal of the distant future; but the Catholic Church realized it

31 See Möhler, *Symbolik*, p. 453. Hefele, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1845, p. 186. Döllinger, p. 190. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, II. 364-390.

long ago. She has preserved and defended her unity as a legacy from the Apostles. Is unity, indeed, to remain a mere ideal, a mere possibility? Even the Reformers thought differently. They, too, aspired to a real and not merely an ideal unity. The Confession of Augsburg teaches "that "the one holy Church must endure for all time; it is the "assembly of believers to whom the Gospel has been preached "in its purity, and the sacraments of the Gospel administered."[32] This statement is, however, tempered by the rider that it is sufficient for true unity if men are agreed on teaching the Gospel and dispensing the Sacraments, and that it is not necessary to receive human traditions, or rites and ceremonies ordained of men. But, after all, it is recognized that real unity is a necessity. Where, then, is it to be found? What real unity is there in the different national churches, in the variety of ever increasing sects? Do they agree in any other essential points, such as Holy Scripture and the Sacraments? All denominations have Holy Scripture in common with the Catholic Church. But to what different uses it was put by the Reformers! How does the question stand now as regards its authenticity and inspiration? Is it not a fact that the Reformed Churches have lately been riven asunder on these points? Again, as to the Sacraments. Baptism and the Eucharist are the only sacraments left in common; but even here what a confusion of tongues prevails! Should not Christ really have taken better measures for safeguarding the unity of doctrine and sacraments in His Church? Surely the decision must rest with antiquity and the entire living Church of the past. The different theological schools, such as Thomists, Scotists, and Molinists existing in the Catholic Church, furnish no ground for a retort. For there is no parity whatever. These schools rest one and all on the same basis of faith, namely the authoritative teaching of the Church. Their unity of faith is assured in the future as in the present. They enjoy the

32 I. 7. *Apol.* c. 4. *De Eccl.* p. 148.

freedom of speculation within certain well-defined limits; it is not the freedom to roam and blunder *ad libitum*, but the freedom of truth, the freedom of children, wherewith the Son of God has made us free in His kingdom of truth.

And if we pass over from the external unity of faith to the internal, so far as it comes within the competency of man to form a judgment at all, we may, without being guilty of presumption, confidently maintain that the unity of internal faith is nowhere so strong as in the Catholic Church. When Hase gives it as his opinion that there are few educated Catholics who would not be ashamed to confess their belief in papal infallibility, he draws his knowledge only from the poisoned wells of the Old Catholics. The last decade must have convinced him that he was wrong.

With justice the Vatican Council could say "No one is "ignorant that the heresies proscribed by the Fathers of Trent, "by which the divine magisterium of the Church was rejected, "and all matters regarding religion were surrendered to the 'judgment of each individual, gradually became dissolved into "many sects, which disagreed and contended with one another, "until at length not a few lost all faith in Christ. Even the "Holy Scriptures which had previously been declared the sole "source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be held "no longer as divine, but to be ranked among the fictions "of mythology." [33]

How many are there still who will swear with full conviction on *articles* of faith or on *symbolical* books? But does not truth transcend unity? Verily. So far, however, are Catholics from setting unity above truth that they steadfastly believe that truth is to be found only in unity, because truth is one, as Christ and God are one. So long as Christianity passes for a divinely revealed religion, its truth cannot be guaranteed by the fallible reason of individuals, but only by the Spirit of God speaking through the divinely

33 Vat. Council. Dogm. Constit. on Cath. Faith (Card. Manning's translation).

ordained organs of the one Church. Of course according to the mind of Luther,—and the opinion has since become traditional in the Lutheran Church,—pastors are a necessary evil for "simple folk," and their abolition is an ideal to be aimed at. Nevertheless there are many Protestants who look upon this opinion with anxious and grave apprehensions.[34]

34 Achelis, *Theol. Lit. Ztg.* 1887, Nr. 25. col. 609.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

1. Unity gains in importance, as a mark of the Church, the further the Church extends in space and time. When the mark of Catholicity is joined to that of unity, the proof for the true Church grows in evidence and clearness. The one Church is catholic, inasmuch as she is everywhere. She exists at all times and in all places. In the words of S. Augustine: "Catholic unity has encompassed the earth."

The word Catholic, indeed, but not the thing it signifies, is foreign to Scripture. It was to the prophecies which foretold that in Messianic times all peoples should be united,[1] that the Apostles appealed in order to justify the universality of Christianity. The Gospel was to be preached to the Jews first; when they rejected it, S. Paul turned to the heathen. And how numerous were the churches which, in a short time, he established in the Roman empire! "Their sound has gone "forth to all lands, and their words to the ends of the earth." The Fathers loved to dwell on these prophecies of an universal empire embracing all peoples, of one temple for all nations, of one sacrifice to be offered to God in every place.[2] For thus they sought to show that the Catholic Church in spreading itself over the whole world was doing God's will and was consequently the true Church. Heretics and schismatics who recognized the Holy Scriptures, found in these prophecies an

1. Is. xi. 10; xlv. 22. 23; xlix. 1. 6; lv. 1-5: lvi. 2-8; lxvi. 1 seq. For further Literature on the subject see Selbst, p. 272 seq.

2. Mal. i. 11. See also *Doctr. Apost.* (Didache) c. 14.

argument against themselves, which they found it difficult to answer. They could not bring themselves to take refuge in an invisible Church, because this seemed to be foregoing their claim to be the true Church. If the Church of Donatus was the true Catholic Church, the Catholic Church would have been confined to a narrow strip of Africa. How, in that case, had the prophecies been fulfilled?

In the parables of the mustard seed and the marriage feast, Jesus clearly foretold that His Church would cover the earth, and that all peoples would be united in one religious body. He represented Himself as the good shepherd going in quest of other sheep, and praying for all who in future would believe in Him. And He charged the Apostles to teach and to baptize all nations, and to be His witnesses to the ends of the earth.

2. The word "Catholic" would naturally suggest itself after the Church had begun to spread over several countries, after separatist movements had been set on foot, when it became necessary to contrast the whole with the parts. It is first met with in the Epistles of S. Ignatius. After exhorting the faithful to obey the bishop, and vigorously warning them against schism, the Saint declares that "where the bishop is, "there also the people should be, as where Christ Jesus is, "there also is the *Catholic* Church."[3] The author of the martyrdom of S. Polycarp (A.D. 155) relates that the Church of Smyrna sent the following account to the Church of Philomelium in Phrygia, and to all the parishes of the holy Catholic Church in all parts: "He (Polycarp) had ended the prayer in which he "made commemoration of all who had ever conversed with "him, of the little and great, the illustrious and the unknown, "and of the whole Catholic Church spread all over the world, "&c."[4] While designating Polycarp bishop of the *Catholic* Church in Smyrna, he is aware that there is a world-wide Catholic Church, subject to our Lord Jesus Christ, the bishop

3 *Ad Smyrn.* c. 8. 2.
4 *Martyr. Polyc.* 8, 1; 16, 2; 19, 2.

of souls. So he regards every local Church as a part of the universal or Catholic Church, and for this reason the local Church itself as Catholic. Thus the word Catholic denotes one who belongs to the great Church, and is originally connected therewith, in contradistinction to the sects or separate communions which are called after their founders.

3. The *Fragmentum Muratori*, from the indications furnished by its author, belongs approximately to the time of Pope Pius I. (140-155). At all events it may be taken as giving expression in simple catechetical form to the universal belief of the Roman Church at the time of its compilation. Now this fragment considers the Church's unity and Catholicity in their relation to the sacred Scriptures, and to the Church's organic constitution. For it observes that the Gospels, though different, exercise no injurious influence upon the faith of the people, because all are lit up by the one principal spirit. Next it goes on to say that when Paul writes to instruct the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, every one knows that there is but one Church on earth, and that when John writes to the seven Churches in the Apocalypse, he writes for all. The proof that the disputed Scriptures are genuine rests on the honour in which they are held in the Catholic Church, and on the sanction given to them by the Church's discipline. The Apocrypha cannot be received in the Catholic Church any more than gall can blend with honey. By mentioning Bishop Pius by name, "who was sitting in the chair of the Roman "Church when Hermas was writing his *Pastor*," he removes all doubt as to his conception of the Catholic Church.*

4. The learned, it is true, are not quite agreed on the

* "Et licet varia singulis evangeliorum principia doceantur, nihil tamen differt "credentium fidei, cum uno ac principali spiritu declarata sint in omnibus omnia " . . . licet pro correptione iteretur [scil. ad Corinthios et Thessalonicenses], "una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse dignoscitur . . . "licet septem Ecclesiis scribat, tamen *omnibus* dicit. Verum ad Filemonem una, "et ad Titum una et ad Timotheum duas pro affectione et dilectione, in honorem "tamen ecclesiae catholicae . . : Pastorem vero nuperim et temporibus "nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente in cathedra urbis Romae "ecclesiae Pio epe. fratre ejus."

meaning of the word, as applied to the letters of the first Apostles, "Catholic Epistles." Still there are only two possible meanings in this connection, and both serve to throw light on its ecclesiastical usage. For they were so called either because they were generally recognized by the Church, or because they were circular letters addressed to the whole Church. The term "Catholic Epistles" first came into use in Alexandria. Clement "explained the Epistle of Jude, and "the other Catholic Epistles, and the Epistle of Barnabas." Origen calls the Epistle of Jude, the 1st Epistle of S Peter, and S. John's Epistle, Catholic Epistles. The last of these Dionysius also describes as "Catholic." Eusebius comprises all seven under this name. Clement likewise gives this name to the letter of the Apostolic Council, and Origen to the Epistle of Barnabas. And Eusebius relates that according to Apollonius, the Montanist Themison presumed to write a Catholic Epistle for the instruction of Christendom.[5] From these facts it is evident that the word when applied to the Church, had reference to its universality.

5. The word "Catholic," then, as referring to the universal Church, had, at a very early age, passed into common usage, and become an ingredient in the common faith in Rome, Asia Minor, Alexandria, and Palestine. What wonder, then, if it also entered into the creed: "I believe in the One, Holy, "Catholic Church?" Clement of Alexandria's words presuppose the existence of this article in the Apostolic creed: "For from the very reason that God is one, and the Lord one, "that which is in the highest degree honourable is lauded in "consequence of its singleness, being an imitation of the one "first principle. In the nature of the One, then, is associated "in a joint heritage the one Church, which they strive to "cut asunder into many sects. Therefore, in substance and "idea, in origin, in pre-eminence, we say that the ancient "and universal Church is alone, collecting as it does into the

5 See Aberle-Schanz, *Einleitung*, p. 242. Kaulen, *Einleitung*, p. 548.

"unity of the one faith—which results from the peculiar "Testaments, or rather in the one Testament in different "times.[6] . . . ." The Nicene Creed retained the article. People now began to say: "My name is Christian, and my "surname Catholic."[7] "I am a Catholic Christian."[8]

6. And now the time was come when the light of reflection was brought to bear upon the phrase that had grown out of the universal belief, and had become the watchword of orthodoxy. The meaning and reasons assigned for its usage were taken from the nature of things. Catholicity meant universality in time and space. The Church is Catholic, because she has existed without a break since the time of the Apostles, and because she is a girdle encircling the earth. The same truth is preached *everywhere*, and the same sacraments are dispensed *to all men*. Such is the explanation that Cyril of Jerusalem gives of the article in the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the One, "Holy, Catholic Church. Her name is Catholic, because she "is spread all over the earth, and stretches from end to end; "because she universally (καθολικῶs) and uninterruptedly teaches "all the doctrines of faith necessary for man to know; because "she presses into God's service the whole human race, whether "rulers or subjects, learned or unlearned; lastly, because she "heals all maladies of soul and body."[9]

7. As a rule, heretics and schismatics did not dare to label their conventicles Catholic. They appeared later on the scene; they were confined to a narrow strip of territory. Moreover, their very variety helped to emphasize the universality of the Church, and their many contradictory doctrines set out in bold relief the one universal truth. Hence Catholic or universal became synonymous with orthodox. None but the Catholic truth is the same all the world over. In this concerted harmony of the many local churches, the Fathers saw a powerful and

6 *Strom.* vii. 17. (Clark's Transl.)
7 Pacianus, *ad Sempron. Ep.* I. 3.
8 August., *de util. cred.* I. 2.
9 *Catech.* xviii. 231.

irresistible argument for the truth of the Catholic Church. Heretics, who paraded themselves as the elect of Christianity, and tried to represent their Church as Catholic, only made themselves a laughing-stock. Cyprian[*] likened Novatian to a monkey. Monkeys are not men, but they mimic men ; so Novatian, by aping Catholics, thought to establish his claim to Catholic truth. Heretics, as S. Augustine reminds us, have smuggled but a few doctrines from the Catholic Church. Hence, while flying at one another's throats, they are always prepared to make common cause against the Church. If the stray truths in each heresy were put together, the resultant would only be an approximation to Catholic truth.

Among the reasons given by S. Augustine for remaining in the Catholic Church, is the name "Catholic" itself, which the Church alone, amid a legion of heresies, has retained. "Although there be many heresies, each striving to appear "as Catholic and branding as heretics those who differ from "*it*, yet there is but one Church, as all admit. . . . This "is the Catholic Church, to which heretics give different "names, each heresy choosing a different word to express "that which they cannot deny in her. Hence it is easy to see "to whom an impartial tribunal would award the name "'*Catholic*,' which all covet."[10] The saint considers the surest way to find the Catholic Church, the one he himself had trodden ; Follow the road of Catholic discipline, which leads from Christ through the Apostles to ourselves, and thence passes on to posterity. "We must hold fast to the Christian religion and the communion of that Church which "both is, and is called Catholic. Heretics and schismatics "whether they like it or no, are obliged when speaking with "strangers to call her the Catholic Church. For, unless "they call her by the name by which she is known all over "the globe, they are not understood."[11]

8. The Fathers put to practical use this involuntary

* *Epist.* 73, 2. Cf. Lactant., *Instit.* iv. 29.
10 Aug. *de util cred.* vii. 19. cf, xiv. 32 ; xvi. 34 ; *Ep.* 93, 7 ; *C. Ep. Man. Fund.* c. 4, 5.
11 *De Vera relig.* 12. cf. 7. *Ep.* 105. 3.

admission on the part of heretics, by employing it as a sort of *argumentum ad hominem* against them. Although, says S. Augustine, all heretics wish to be called Catholics, yet no heretic, if asked by a stranger where was the Catholic Church, would dare to point to his own house or conventicle. Cyril of Jerusalem applies it in the following way: "But since the word Church or Assembly is applied to "different things (. . . I mean the meetings of the heretics, "the Marcionists and Manichees and the rest), the Faith "has delivered to thee by way of security the article: 'And "in One Holy Catholic Church,' that thou mayest avoid "their wretched meetings, and ever abide with the Holy "Church Catholic in which thou wast regenerated. And "if ever thou art sojourning in any city, inquire not simply "where the Lord's House [Τὸ Κυριακόν] is, but where is "the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of "this holy body, the mother of us all, which is the spouse "of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son. . . . "And while the kings of particular nations have bounds "set to their dominion, the Holy Church Catholic alone "extends her illimitable sovereignty over the whole world, "for God, as it is written, hath made her border peace."[12]

Could the visibility of the Church have been more lucidly expressed? The Catholic visible Church, which is everywhere in its adherents, in its discipline and worship, and bishops, must have made a powerful impression alike on friends and foes. "In the Scriptures," says S. Augustine, "we learn Christ. In the Scriptures, we also learn "the Church. We have the Scriptures in common, why "have we not also the Church in common? If you hold "fast to Christ, why not also to the Church? If through "the truth of the Scriptures you believe in Christ whom "you do not see, why do you deny the Church which you "do see and of which you likewise read in the Scriptures? "Because we foretell you this, and exhort you to peace "and love, the greatest good, we are become your

12 Catech. xviii. 26, 27. (Oxford Transl.)

enemies."[13] Nay, he characterizes it as an heretical device to derive the name Catholic not from its universal communion, but from its observance of all God's commandments and sacraments. As if, forsooth, granting that the Church were also called Catholic from holding fast to all truth, Catholics had no other argument than the mere name, and not the prophecies and words of Christ, to prove that the Church is universal and world-wide.[14] The expansion of the Catholic Church, which is everywhere visible and palpable, is the chief reason why Catholicity is a mark and a visible sign of that true Church, which prophets foretold, Christ and the Apostles preached.[15]

9. The Fathers, it is true, in the exuberance of their joy, often gave a highly coloured account of the spread of Christianity. Thus Tertullian and Origen boasted to the heathen that Christians, although only creatures of yesterday, were already peopling the cities, and islands, and markets, and swarming in the camp, the palace, the senate and the forum; in fine, they had left nothing empty but the temples.[16] They start, indeed, from the historical fact that Christianity had already penetrated into every province and into all classes of society, but the rhetorical and apologetic cast of their story should not pass unnoticed. Some are but too ready to set down Tertullian as a great exaggerator, "*magnus quidàm ubique* "*rerum amplificator*" (Vavassor). Compared with the heathen multitude Christians were, indeed, but a speck on the horizon, but their courageous faith and moral purity made them a power in the world that was not to be underrated.

When persecution had found itself powerless to stamp out Christianity, and a friendly policy had been inaugurated by

13 Epist. 105, 3. 4. 5.

14 Ep. 93, 7, 23. cf. *Ep.* 185, 1, 5; *In Ps.* xxx; *Sermo* ii. 4, 8; *De unit eccles.* ii. 2; iii. 5; v. 8; xix. 49.

15 Euseb. Caes., in Ps. 81, 8; in Ps. 32, 17; Epiph., *Haer.* 61, 2; Greg. Naz., *C. Iul.* i. 6, 7; Chrys. *Homil in Matth.* 54, 2; Hieron; *Adv. Lucif.* n. 15.

16 Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 37. *Adv Iud.* c. 7. Bellarm. *De Controv.* Tom. ii. l. ii. 4, 7.

Constantine, Christianity quickly asserted its enduring superiority, until at length the empire was converted. S. Augustine frequently boasts that people were afraid to profess belief in heathenism. For, says he, there are more Christians in the world than Jews and pagans combined. Of the immense multitude living beyond the confines of the Roman empire, the Fathers had not the faintest suspicion. Even now it is hardly possible to form an exact estimate of the population of the earth, but it may be set down approximately at 1445 millions; of these about 450 millions are Christians, of whom 225 millions are Catholics.

Was it not, therefore, arrogance on the part of the Fathers to assume the name Catholic? Or, at least is it not so nowadays, when the true proportion is more accurately known? In the first place, it should be borne in mind that the designation was assumed in contradistinction to the Christian sects. In contrast with the heathen, the name Christian was sufficient, except when it became necessary, in opposition to the sects, to set prominently before men the true Catholic Church founded by Christ, in order to guard her from misconception and confusion. All the sects, in common with the Catholic Church, regard Christianity as the means of sanctification instituted by Christ, and intended to fill the earth and save all men. From among the different communities one must be true and Apostolic. And viewing the question from an *external* standpoint, which can be the true Church, if it be not the one that best answers to the description given by Christ and the prophets, that is most widely spread, and counts most members? This was the Catholic Church, as the name indicates. And even in these days, if looked at from this point of view, she can justly lay claim to this title, both in the face of the orthodox [Greek] and reformed Churches.

10. Still greatness of extent must be considered as well as mere numbers. No Church, but the Catholic, can point to believers all the world over, who are in communion with

the universal Church. With a few unimportant exceptions, no power has ever succeeded in suppressing her, nor has the violence done to her weakened her expansiveness. Lamentable as schisms are for the body of Christ, they serve to reveal the unconquerable might of the Catholic Church, and to open out for her new fields of labour. From the very first, the Catholic Church, mindful of our Lord's words: "Going teach "all nations," has ever considered her chief mission to lie in evangelizing unbelievers and Jews. She it was who overcame the Roman empire, and won it over to Christianity. Without a compactly organized Church this gigantic struggle would have been hopeless. And she carried the torch of the Gospel in turn to the wild tribes of Asia, Egypt, and North Africa, and won over to Christ Celts, Germans and Sclavs. This great work has been done by the Church, not by this sect or that or by all together, nay not even by the Eastern Church. S. Augustine's outspoken conviction holds good at all times of the Catholic Church: that the power and energy that has endured in her since the days of the Apostles prove her to be the true Church.

All the sects, as the Fathers were quick to observe, without distinction, have drawn their recruits, not from the heathen, but from Christians whom they have seduced from the true faith, from the one body of Christ. "They make it their business," says Tertullian, "not to convert the heathen, but to subvert "our people; this is rather the glory at which they catch: to compass the fall of those who stand, not to raise those who have "fallen. Accordingly, since the very work which they propose to "themselves comes not from the building-up their own society, "but from demolishing the truth, they undermine our edifices, "that they may erect their own."[17] And S. Augustine compares heretics with a hen that gathers round her the young ducks, as if they were her own chicks. "For, those whom they seduce in "the name of Christ, they find ready-made Christians. They

17 *De Praescript.* c. 42.

"find them born again of the Gospel of Christ, and then "boast of them as their own riches."[18]

11. But the missionary labours of the Church are cast in quite another mould. She never lost sight of those that were sitting in darkness and the shadows of death. And although violently assailed in Europe by the Reformation, she had sufficient strength to turn her attention to the heathen in lands newly discovered. Missionaries followed in the wake of the brave navigators. China and Japan beheld the ambassadors of the Gospel. The career of S. Francis Xavier is an eloquent testimony to the Church's great missionary labours. In America the footprints of the conquerors were stained with blood, but the Church's missioners came with the olive branch of peace. Considering, on the one hand, the abominable idolatry of the Mexicans, culminating in countless human sacrifices, and the low ebb of civilization to which the Indians had sunk, we cannot but marvel at the great progress effected by missionary zeal in South and Central America. While, in the North, the Indians were being trodden down or exterminated, the Spaniards were rearing a race of Christian half-breds, whose religion and morality, indeed, though leaving much to desire, betokened distinct progress. Had not the Indian Reservations been ruthlessly destroyed by wily cunning and brutality, the wretched savages would even now be leading a peaceful and happy life with the "good Fathers." Success follows slowly on missioners in Africa, but they have to contend against peculiar difficulties. Islam declares war *à outrance* on every mission. The ancient civilized religions of India and China are conservative and stationary, in proportion to their antiquity. Let us hope that even here the blood of the martyrs will prove the seed of Christianity. Even a Protestant witness[19] is forced to confess: "Not only in newly discovered lands, but "all the world over, on every shore washed by the ever

18 *C. Faust. Manich.*, xiii. 121

19 Plath, ap. Zöckler, iii. 168

"mounting billows of commerce, the Roman Catholic Church "is often the first to show the way, proclaiming and giving "effect to her tendency to universality." He naturally adds: "often not without invading the territories pre-occupied by "others, on the pretext that she is the only legitimate "[Evangelizer]."

12. The Reformed Churches, following the example set long ago by ancient heretics, have recruited their ranks from Catholics. Nay, even to this day, they are driving their missionary trade in such thoroughly Christian countries as Spain and Italy. It is significant that they only undertook the heathen mission at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The sums contributed for this purpose in Germany, England, and America, apart from Bible Society proceeds, are very considerable. Missionaries are at work in many stations, chiefly in Asia and Africa. But the materials furnished by statistics are at present insufficient to enable us to judge of their success. In any case Protestant missionary colleges cannot compare with the Propaganda in Rome, which is Catholic missionary enterprise in miniature. Protestant missions too are, as a rule, independent of the ecclesiastical rulers of their own native land, and have no common centre. Let us listen once more to the same Protestant voice: "Only in a few places are large com-"munities formed; in the majority the fundamental stage has "not been passed." The "English-American Mission" alone leaves "the impression of being comparatively more vigorous, "and of making rapid progress among modern heathenism." But when the same writer adds that this mission has outstripped "even the work of the Roman Catholic Church," he had in view merely the external apparatus and momentary flash of success. Had he perused the reports of Catholic Missions, they would have convinced him that his account is one-sided. Be this as it may, in any case they one and all abandon the principle of *Catholicity* at the very outset,

The authors of the *formula concordiæ* ventured, though

somewhat timidly, to claim Catholicity for the Augsburg Confession, on the ground that it had been "publicly "diffused among all Christians and all lands, was everywhere "becoming known, and had begun to be in the mouths "of all."[20] But Bellarmine had no difficulty in showing that the claim was preposterous. All the Reformed Churches combined, neither then nor now, can bear comparison with the Catholic Church. In a certain sense, it is true, heresy is as ubiquitous as the Church. It dogs the Church at the heels, as the shadow follows light. But the Church is one, while heresy is multiple. So another meaning had to be found for the word "Catholic"; namely, that suggested by the Apology. "The Apostles' Creed," it says, "calls the Church Catholic, not that we may suppose the Church to be a state institution comprising many peoples, but rather that all men, scattered over all lands, who are in agreement as regards the Gospel, may have the same Christ, the same Holy Spirit, and the same Sacraments, whether they have the same traditions of men or not."[21] But who are those that agree about the Gospel, have the same faith and the same Sacraments? And what Sacraments? Those of the Catholic Church or the Sects? The whole statement begs the question at issue; is a perversion of the article in the Apostolic Creed; takes no cognisance of the divine organization of the Church; makes her in fact invisible; and destroys both unity and catholicity.

The objection raised by S. Augustine against the Donatists may still, with equal force, be urged against Protestants. Indeed, it was actually thrown in Luther's teeth. We have only to substitute the word German for African, and S. Augustine's words apply perfectly. "Do you imagine that the African "(German) Church is the Catholic Church? The Gospels tell "us that the Church would cover the whole earth. The same, "moreover, has been foretold by the Law, the Prophets and

20 *Praef.* 2. Bellarm. ii. 4, 7.
21 *Cap.* 4 *de Eccles.* 2: 9.

"the Psalms, as Christ Himself assured us. . . . These "words were followed by deeds. Scripture shows how the "Church began in Jerusalem, how she spread first through "Judæa and Samaria, and then over the whole earth. She "is still growing and will continue to grow until she enclose all "peoples within her bosom. Let him who preaches another "Gospel be anathema. Such a one is he who says that the "Church has perished everywhere outside Donatus and Africa. "Therefore let him be anathema."[22]

In course of time, as the Church widened her sphere, the bond of living faith working through charity became relaxed in many. The bright picture of Christian faith and virtue painted by the Apologists was sure, sooner or later, to fade in parts. But did the Church therefore cease to be Catholic? Or, from the moment that cockle appeared among the wheat, did she even lose her former character as an institution for saving mankind? There is a theory broached to the effect that the Catholic Church, as faith blossomed into dogma (doctrine of faith), thrust herself between the individual man and his salvation, and thus by making herself a necessary condition of salvation ceased to be a real means of salvation and a real community of saints. Hence it was only natural that about 220 A.D., the Roman bishop Calixtus should have laid down the proposition, that wheat and cockle must grow up together in the Catholic Church, and that Noah's ark, with its clean and unclean animals, was a type of the Church.[23] How hollow all this is! Did not our Lord Himself liken the kingdom of heaven to a field in which the cockle grew up among the wheat? Did He not foretell that not every one that said Lord, Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? What mean, too, the parables of the great supper, of the wise and foolish virgins? Does not the Apostle, too, declare over and over again that the impure and the covetous and such

22 *De Unit* xii. 32.
23 Harnack, i. 308.

like shall not possess the kingdom of God, in order to keep the faithful away from sin? He implies, indeed, that there are sinners among the saints. But who can say that he is without sin? The visible external Church, as we have already explained, implies an invisible Church, as the living body implies a soul, both being intimately connected, the visible being under certain definite conditions the means of reaching the invisible. All that can be said, then, is that sinners belong mainly to the visible Church, and only partially to the invisible. Both these ideas are found combined in *Pastor Hermas*. The simile of the ark very naturally fits in with I Peter III. 20, and was often employed by the Fathers.

13. The primitive idea of the Church, therefore, has undergone no change whatever.[24] It is and has ever been what it was in the beginning; unless, indeed, we say that the Church as such has entirely ceased to be. For the Church has never existed without dogmatic teaching and ecclesiastical discipline. Nor is the plea, that the Church has changed, new. Once more St Augustine shall be our spokesman. For this was the very taunt that the Donatists flouted in the Church's face: that she had fallen away from her primitive sanctity, and had thereby, as it were, died of an infectious disease. Everywhere, they said, not only was there cockle among the wheat, but the wheat all over the field, that is the world, except in the Donatist corner, had died.[25] "Is it then in vain that "the Lord commanded to let both the cockle and the wheat "grow together until the harvest? Is it in vain that He "promised to remain with His Church till the end of time? "Does it chance that the Church of all nations has perished, "and is only to be found with a handful of Donatists?" This contention Augustine characterized as insolent, outrageous, and worthy of all reprobation. "Nothing now was wanting "but to assert that those who believe in God, have fallen away

24 See Aug. *De Civ. Dei.* xviii. 49; Hieron, *Adv. Lucif.* n. 22; Schwane, ii. 834; also *Apol. Conf.* iv. 7; Pastor Hermae, *Simil.* ix.

25 *De Haer.* c. 69; *C. Lit. Petil.* ii. 78. 174; *C. Crescon.* ii. 27; *Ep.* 105, 5, 16.

"from the faith, but that those who believe in man, are the "faithful. Yet God has said: 'In thy name shall all generations "be blessed.'"[26] (Gen. XXII. 18). Nor, again, would it avail the Donatists to appeal to the end of time, when faith will grow cold; unless they had first converted the whole world. Since, therefore, that Church is recognized in Scripture as true "which has spread its roots in all nations, it can only be "the Catholic Church." "The Church will never come to an "end. The gates of hell shall never prevail against her. "And she will ever be Catholic, and overspread the globe." Thus in Augustine the "principle of Catholicity" triumphed over the "principle of sanctity."[27] In other words, the Church principle that has ever been abiding in the Christian communion from the beginning, has triumphed, and all attacks on it have been repelled.

Not faith for its own sake, but faith as the groundwork and root of the Christian life of grace and virtue, leads to salvation. But this life of grace and virtue Our Lord Himself has made dependent on membership of His Church, that society in "which the Sacraments are administered and the Gospel "preached." He that heareth the Apostles, heareth Christ; and he that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican. Anyhow, men had not then lighted on the "despairing idea of a purely invisible Church." "This idea," says the same author, "would have accelerated "the downfall of Christianity in the Church far more rapidly "than the idea of the Holy Catholic Church."[28] Was there then no hope of saving Christianity from tottering to a fall? Does the Church of Chrysostom, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, of Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and Leo, mark a decline? And where is now the Church of the saints of them that are without sin? The Church, as Augustine retorted on

26 *C. Gaud.* i. 15; Cf. Ambros, *Hexaëm.* iv. 7; In Ps. x. 4, 30; Athan. *In Ps.* lxxxviii. 29; Bellarm. l. c. iii. 16.

27 Reuter, *August. Studien.* Gotha 1887, p. 206. See *Theol. Liter. Ztng.* 1187, Nr. 13.

28 Harnack, p. 309. Note 2.

the Donatists, must have utterly vanished. "Separate, "therefore, the visible holy Sacrament, *which can exist both in* "*the good and in the bad*,—in the former for their reward, in the "latter for judgment; separate it from the invisible function of "charity, which is the peculiar property of the good. Separate "them, separate them, aye, and may God separate you from the "party of Donatus, and call you back again into the Catholic "Church, whence you were torn by them while yet a catechumen "to be bound by them in deadly bonds."[29]

14. The religious craving for internal unity, and for external interaction and co-operation, is best satisfied by the idea of community. The whole community seems like one great family of God, whose members, united to themselves and to God by charity, strive, by mutually supporting one another, to accomplish the great end of mankind.[30] In what does a Catholic find the highest contentment of mind and heart? In the growing consciousness that millions of others, separated by mountain and valley, land and sea, are worshipping God in the same language, and with the same sacrifice and sacraments.

29 Aug. *C. Lit. Petil.* ii. 104. 239; *De Bapt.* iii. 2; v. 60.
30 Möhler, p. 334.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CHURCH INFALLIBLE.

1*. The Christian Revelation, as finally proclaimed by the Apostles and preserved by the Church Apostolic, is the ***absolute truth***, the supreme law for the human mind and will, the rule of thought and action. It is given for all men, individually and collectively. It is valid for every place, and for all time. It is One, Catholic and Apostolic. To say, therefore, that the Church is One, Catholic and Apostolic implies that she preserves this absolute truth whole and intact, as she received it from the Apostles; that she preserves it for all ages, and for all sorts and conditions of men. But if this be so, the Church must be infallible; that is, she must hold a guarantee, as absolute as the divine truth she preserves—a divine warrant that she is never mistaken in announcing the complete revelation given by Jesus Christ and His Apostles. And, indeed, how could the Church maintain her unity for long, without such an absolute surety? Of what avail would be her apostolicity, unless it were a voucher that her faith and doctrines have been kept pure and unadulterated? Unity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity are correlative with the absolute truth, or rather with the certainty of possessing absolute truth. And this certainty cannot be hers otherwise than by a *charisma veritatis*, a divine gift of inerrancy. Surpassingly great as is man's mind and will, he cannot lay hold of absolute truth; nor, if he had it within his grasp, could he retain it pure and perfect so as to transmit it to posterity. Revelation, too, by its very nature, exacts acceptance,

on the part of man, by faith. But faith supposes authority. There is no faith without authority. Natural faith rests on the authority a man has with his fellow-men. The child believes the authority of its parents; the pupil that of his master. The learned rely on the truthfulness of chroniclers and eye-witnesses. Religious faith requires a divine, that is, an infallible authority, which is no other than God Himself, the very truth. Now if God does not speak directly and immediately to each man, but has revealed His truth through the medium of human organs, these cannot have it in their power to jeopardise the divine certainty necessary for faith. They, like the prophets, must be animated by a divine presence. It was so in Christ, and in His Apostles, and it must be so in His Church. This is an absolutely self-evident truth. There must be an infallible authority, if there is to be any revelation or any faith in the world. Any thing short of this would fail in the task which Christ imposed on His Church. S. Augustine felt the full force of this argument, when he said: "If divine providence does not preside over and guide all "things human, then are we utterly helpless in matters of "religion, and can attain to nothing (certain). But if, on "the other, the beauty that we everywhere see around us, "which evidently flows from some source, and man's own "inner consciousness publicly and privately urge the best souls "to seek God and to serve Him—then there can be no doubt "that God has, somewhere or other, instituted some authority, "by the help of which we can securely raise ourselves to God."[1] But where are men to look for this authority outside the Catholic Church? Who would begin his search with any sect? What can the Manichæans, who have haughtily chosen "Science" for the device emblazoned on their banner, offer in exchange for belief in authority?

2. We have stated these *a priori* considerations merely by way of introduction. For the real proof, however, which is

1 *De Util. Cred.* xvi. 34. Cf. viii. 20; xiv. 31. Möhler, *Symbolik*, p. 333.

quite independent of them, we have to turn once more to the positive ordinances and institutions of our Lord. The Church's Infallibility is closely connected with her Apostolicity. For revelation was completed by the Apostles, and by them committed to the safe-keeping of the Church, in which the Apostolate was to continue for ever as an organic element. The first question then, that presents itself for our consideration is—

1. *THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE APOSTLES AND THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.*

Now on this point there can hardly be a doubt among believers. The word "Apostle," "Apostolic," had from the first such a fascination for believers, that it sufficed to silence all disputes. The principle of Apostolicity, as we have already seen,[2] was the rule according to which doctrine and morals, Scripture and Tradition were measured. It passed as self evident that an Apostolic writing was inspired. No one ever dreamed of demanding further proof.

Now it is easy to show that our Lord promised the Apostles the gift of infallibility, and that they claimed it in practice. When He promised Peter that the gates of hell should never prevail against the Church built on him, He assuredly promised him security from error. When He prayed that Peter's faith might not fail, He held out to him the certain prospect that God would protect His faith. But there are statements still more clear and explicit. To all the disciples together Jesus promised "the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, "because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him; but you shall "know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be "in you." (John XIV. 17). "But when the Paraclete shall "come whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of "truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall give testimony "of me: and you shall give testimony of me, because you

2 *Christian Apol.* vol. II. chap. xii.

"you are with me from the beginning," (xv. 26). "These "things have I spoken to you, remaining with you. But the "Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in "my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all "things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to "you." (xiv. 26). This promise Christ repeated after his resurrection: "And you are witnesses of these things. And "I send the promise of my Father upon you: but stay you "in the city, till you be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 48. 49). "But you shall receive the power of "the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses "unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and "even to the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts i. 8). Before His ascension Jesus gave His disciples their commission: "Go "ye, therefore and teach all nations . . . and behold I "am with you all days even to the consummation of the "world." (Matth. xxviii. 19. 20).

3. "These words were spoken to men but once, yet they "have found an echo in the heart of every believer for eighteen "centuries. The God of universal dominion will never abandon "His Church: no foe shall subdue her, or persecutor destroy "her, or error darken her threshold. For He has promised "that He will ever be at her side, with His all-powerful aid, "when she is discharging her office of teaching all nations, "and of the handing down revealed truth in its purity and "integrity to succeeding generations. And He has likewise "distinctly specified the mode and manner of the aid He "will render to her; when He goes to the Father, He will "send the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, to dwell in His "Church for all time. And it shall be His business to 'lead "'into all truth,' to call all things to their mind that Christ "said and taught. So, ever since the first Pentecost, the "Church has had a divine instructor and guide, and she "herself is the organ through which the Holy Spirit teaches "the faithful."[3] We have quoted these words of Döllinger

3 *Christenthum und Kirche*. 1860. p. 226.

in extenso, to show that it is not the want of Scripture proof, which leads men to doubt the infallible authority of the Apostles and the Church.

A twofold attempt has been made to explain away these ver definite promises. They have, it is said, no reference to an infallible assistance present from the beginning, but only to the gradual development of divine truth, and its realization, on the part of the Church. And it is further alleged that the words bear only on those things which the Apostles were then unable to bear.[4]

But this is the merest subterfuge, and is, moreover, unfair to the texts quoted. It is, indeed, quite true, that part of the divine assistance promised to the Apostles was given to enable them to know fully and to understand what they were before unable to bear. But to set this limit to the divine assistance is altogether a gratuitous supposition. And, we would further ask, how was the gradual development of truth in the Church to take place, unless God were at hand to guide it? If the Apostles required divine assistance the first time they proclaimed revelation, why was it not required for continued preaching, and subsequent development? For the rest, the words of promise are so absolute, that they overrule any such distinction as that suggested above. Again, if it be urged from S. Matthew XVIII. 19. 20, and S. John XIV. 15 seq. that the 'Spirit of Truth' is promised to all believers according to the measure in which they keep Christ's commandments, and that, consequently, it amounts to no more than an increase of inward light and power in grasping truth already known as revealed (Rom. I. 19; ii. 14), just as the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,—then we must admit, indeed, that the fanatical sects (e.g. Waldenses), however mutually contradictory they be, are one and all justified in laying claim to divine guidance. In this case, of course, there can be no question of an Apostolic and

4 Hase, *Polemik*, p. 37. Keller, *Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien.* Leip. 1885, p. 42. 44.

infallible Church, nor, we may add, of Christianity. And, in truth, the Waldenses applied their subjective rule to Holy Scripture, by insisting that Scripture itself should furnish the proof that Christ made the so-called Canonical books, and no others, to be the rule of salvation. They did not consider the Apostles infallible. They drew a distinction, according to their own whims and caprice, between things in Scripture that are and that are not necessary for salvation. The Old Testament was valid only in so far as it clearly harmonized with Christ's words. And Christ's words were made into a sort of easy standard for measuring S. Paul's teaching. Similar distinctions are current nowadays between the teaching of Christ and of the Apostles, between that of the first Apostles and S. Paul Thus all authority, even that of Holy Scripture, is tossed to the winds, and rationalism, with the thinnest veneer of fanciful Christianity, is erected into the principle and rule of faith.

4. Now, be it noted, we are not wholly denying that the promises, made directly to the Apostles, were often intended for the whole Church, regarded as the communion of believers;[8] but they were always intended for the faithful in the Catholic Church; for the faithful that were begotten of the Church that is built upon the foundation of the Apostles. To the Church modelled on the Apostles, which the Apostles were charged to spread to the ends of the earth, which could glory in possessing the Apostolic writings and tradition,—to her, as a community, not to individuals as such, nor to any portion of believers, who chose to form themselves into a particular association, were the promises made. This mutual relation between the Church and its members, between the *Ecclesia docens* and the *Ecclesia discens*, must naturally be taken as self-evident. Hence, at the Seventh General Council (787 A.D.), the words in Matth. XXVIII. 20, far from being restricted to the disciples, were extended to all who through them should believe. Nevertheless, in their decree of faith the bishops appeal to Christ, the Apostles and

8 Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit* 2, 115. See Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* 2 edit. iii. 467. 472.

prophets, and to the teaching of the Apostles, in other words, to infallible teachers. "No one" says Langen, explained the passage of the "infallibility of the hierarchy." Granted; but was it not generally considered a proof of the infallibility of that Church, which had always recognized a teaching hierarchy, and constantly appealed to the infallibility of the Apostles?

5. Called to be witnessses by our Lord Himself, the Apostles ever considered themselves witnesses of Christ in a twofold capacity; as natural eye-witnesses of the public ministry of Jesus from His baptism till His ascension into heaven, (Acts I. 21, seq); and also inasmuch as they were endowed with power from on high to bear infallible testimony to Christ, the Son of God. Jesus, by closely uniting both elements, and by pointing to the power of the Holy Ghost as the unmistakable sign of divine testimony, laid the foundation for the infallible teaching office of the Church in the Apostles. He that rejects the testimony of the Apostles withstands the Holy Spirit. After the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles, it is true, laid most stress on the *visible* wonderful workings of the Holy Spirit. But, surely, this was quite natural. For were they not the credentials of the Apostolate? Did they not serve to set a divine seal of attestation on the preaching of Peter and the Apostles? How, otherwise, would Peter have dared, fearlessly and courageouly, to preach the kingdom of God before the people and the Sanhedrim? How could he have thrown in their teeth that they had "killed the Lord of Life?" "If it be just," said they, "in the sight of God, to hear you "rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the "things which we have seen and heard." (Acts IV. 19. 20). To Ananias Peter addresses the solemn words: "Why hath "Satan tempted thy heart that thou shouldst lie to the Holy "Ghost? . . . . Thou hast not lied to men but to God." (Acts V. 3 4.) "Why have you agreed together," said he to Saphira, "to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?" (v. 9) And

although the whole Church is mentioned as present at the Apostolic Council, in addition to the Apostles and ancients, still the Apostles are conspicuously pre-eminent. They drew up the decree, of which they could say: "It hath seemed good "to the Holy Ghost and to us." (Acts xv. 28.) Clearly then, the visible manifestations were a sign of the invisible presence of the Holy Ghost, and of divine authority in the Apostles.

6. But, it may be asked, how comes it, then, that Peter was previously uncertain as to whether the Gentiles should be received into the Church, and that a vision was necessary to make known to him that he was not to call common what God had purified? (Acts x. 15.)* When the Holy Ghost fell upon Cornelius and "all them that were hearing the word," "the "faithful of the circumcision, who had come with Peter, were "astonished because the grace of the Holy Ghost was also "poured out upon the Gentiles. For they heard them speaking "with tongues and magnifying God. Then Peter answered: "Can any man forbid water that these should be baptized, who "have received the Holy Ghost as well as we"[7] (x. 45-47). There have been some commentators, who thought that Peter fell into a dogmatic error, but there is no foundation whatever for such an opinion. The purely ritual and pedagogic character of the whole proceeding is too patent to have any wider importance attached to it.

7. Still greater capital is made out of the famous scene between Peter and Paul at Antioch, as an argument against Peter's infallibility. Peter must, it is said, have either forgotten or laid aside the Apostolic decree almost immediately. Grant-

7 Didym., *De Trinit.* ii. 6, 13; iii. 19. Cyrill. Alex.; in Joann. xvi. 12. Asterius, Anastasius, et alii. See Langen, 1, 101; 2, 120.

* A careful perusal of the chapter will convince the reader that Peter was perfectly aware that the Gospel was intended to be preached and to bring remission of sins to all (x. 42). Again, the doubt which he had concerned first the *meaning* of the vision; and afterwards the sincerity of Cornelius in sending for him (x. 20). The question seems to have reduced itself to one of opportuneness. He may not have known that all ritualistic scruples had to be set aside forthwith. For the rest, one fails to see why this revelation to Peter was not part of the divine assistance of the Holy Ghost, who continued to lead them into all truth. See the Author's remarks N. 8. *Tr.*

ing the latter alternative, it is quite plain that the decrees of the Council were framed for Gentile Christians, while Peter and John ministered to the circumcision. Thus the Jewish Christians and Peter were perfectly free to keep the law. And this seems to have been the general practice till the destruction of the Temple. But had not Peter previously followed the usages of the Church at Antioch? Certainly. And S. Paul administers a sharp rebuke to him for changing: "But when "Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, "because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from "James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, "he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of "the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews "consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that "dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly "unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas before them "all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the "Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the "Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Gal. II. 11-14).

And what follows from this? Nothing more than that Peter in a point of discipline, which the Apostolic Council had left open, had yielded to the pressure of circumstances. He had given offence to the Gentile Christians, because till then he had sat at their tables; but he did not impose on them the obligation of imitating his subsequent conduct. At most his example may have perplexed their consciences,[8] but the Jews might have been equally perplexed had he taken the opposite line of conduct. He was on the horns of a dilemma—that trying situation in which each one has to follow his own judgment. The spectacle of Peter rushing impetuously and boldly ahead, and then being quickly discouraged and falling back again, corresponds exactly with his character as pourtrayed in the gospels (the same may be said of S. Paul's sharp rebuke), but it has nothing whatever to do with his infallibility.

8 See Döllinger, p. 62.

Origen defends S. Peter's action in both cases with the remark: "It was fitting that those sent to the Jews should not "depart from Jewish customs. . . Nay Paul himself became "a Jew to the Jews, and a Gentile to the Gentiles."[9] Jerome certainly had Origen, Eusebius, and Clement in mind when he strove to represent the entire proceeding at Antioch as dissimulation. Then arose the famous controversy between Jerome and Augustine, which ended in Augustine rejecting the theory of lying or dissimulation, and thereby placing the authority of Holy Scripture above all other writings. Jerome, who had previously taken another view, eventually silently acquiesced in Augustine's.[10] To Junilius the story in the Epistle to the Galatians seems to be drawn with a free hand.[11] Tertullian's summing up is the simplest: "It was a fault of "conduct not of preaching. He walked not according to "Gospel truth." Other Fathers, indeed, take the incident as proving that even the Prince of the Apostles has made momentary mistakes in matters of faith. Such an explanation is advanced by Gelasius, Pelagius II., and Gregory the Great.[12] But these Fathers and Popes were not drawing a distinction between matters of faith, strictly so called, and ecclesiastical or disciplinary matters. Their phrases, now bold, now mild, can be easily fitted unto Tertullian's dictum. Vigilius' conduct at Constantinople, which did not touch faith, is excused in this way by Pelagius II. In particular, it is most noteworthy that the Fathers draw no conclusion against Peter's position. Rather, they emphasize his love of peace, and the humility with

9 C. Cels. II. 1.

10 *C. Ruf.* iii. 2. *Dial. c. Pelag.* i. 22. *Comm. in Ep. ad Philem.* v. 8. Concerning the dispute between the two Fathers of the Church, see Möhler, *Schriften* i. 1 seq. Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 62. Hergenröther, *Handbuch der Kircheng.* i. p. 100. As to the dispute between Peter and Paul, see Overbek, *Ueber die Auffassung des Streites*, etc. Basel 1877. Holsten, *Evangel. des Petrus and Paulus*, 1868, p. 278. 556. Metz, *Die Antipetrinische Rede des Paulus.* Hamburg, 1881. Wetzel, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1880, p. 432. Zimmer, *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theolog.* 1882, p. 129.

11 *Instit.* i. 6. Tertull., *De Praescr.* c. 23.

12 Gelas. ap. Mansi viii. 88. Gregor., *In Ezech*, ii. 6. 9. Langen, *Die Kirchenväter*, p. 140 *Unfehlbarkeit*, p. 203. Hase, *Polemik*, p. 37.

which he, the Chief of the Apostles, received S. Paul's reprimand.

8. Moreover, it should be remembered that, in spite of the coming of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles did not receive from the outset the entire deposit of all revealed truth, or of the guidance of the Church. Circumstances were bound to arise in which leading principles could not be immediately applied. For the Apostles were not tools of dead machinery, but living witnesses of Christ. But they were fully persuaded that the Spirit of God would instruct and sustain them at the right time. Special revelations and inspirations rather confirm than preclude Apostolic infallibility. And from the life of S. Paul we know that, in the most important junctures of his missionary career, he was guided by special revelations from the Holy Spirit.[13] Nevertheless he is conscious that he also possesses habitually the Spirit of God (I Cor. vii. 40). Christ speaks through him, or he speaks in Christ (II Cor. ii. 17 seq; xiii. 3). The power of Christ dwells in him (II Cor. xii. 9). Hence he requires that his teaching and orders be obeyed. Nay, so sure is he of the truth of his Gospel, that he would not receive any other, even if it were brought by an angel from heaven (Gal. i. 1 seq.)

Who, then, can doubt that the Apostles as a body considered themselves infallible witnesses of Jesus Christ, and as infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit in preaching the Gospel? Their doctrine is the doctrine of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, the truth coming down from the Father of lights. He that heareth them heareth Christ, and he that despiseth them despiseth Christ, and the Father who sent Him. He that denieth their teaching, denieth the faith and Christ and God, and compasseth his own destruction. The Holy Spirit leads the Apostles into the truth that Christ revealed, and gives them an insight into the mysteries of the kingdom of God, that Christ preached. They had not everything formally cut and dry. They are but

13 Acts xiii. 2; xvi. 6. 9; xx. 23; xxvii. 23. II Cor. xii. 1 seq. See Döllinger, p. 87.

little solicitous about building up a scientific system of faith. With them everything quivers with life, because Christ, the risen Saviour, who liveth and dieth now no more, is the centre of their faith and life. But the main features of their doctrines of faith are closely drawn to scale from the words and deeds of Jesus. These must be scrupulously adhered to under peril of salvation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. How shall they believe unless they hear the word preached? And how shall they preach unless they be sent? (Rom. x. 14).

9. But S. Paul goes on to say that the *Church* built on and guided by the Apostles is the pillar and the ground of truth (I Tim. iii. 15). He does not speak of the Church in the abstract, but in the concrete, as it then existed. We admit that he does not expressly mention the teaching body of bishops. But, even if Paul meant that the "entire Christian "commonwealth" was the pillar and ground of truth, at all events the teaching body was included (Ephes. iv.). And we know from the pastoral Epistles, and from the character of those to whom they were addressed, that the teaching body was far from occupying the lowest place in the Christian commonwealth; for at its head stood the Apostle himself. By speaking of the house of God, and then adding immediately: "evidently great is the mystery of piety," the Apostle shows that he meant christianity in its entirety, doctrines, and all that the whole Church holds in common. From this and similar passages taken by themselves, we can only conclude that infallibility exists in the Church founded by Christ, that is, in the Apostolic Church. For Christ left His Church without spot or wrinkle of error (Ephes. i. 23; v. 26 seq). He built it on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets (ii. 20).

We thus glide from the infallibility of Apostles to that of the Church, S. Paul himself establishing the transition. In the Epistles that he wrote during or after his imprisonment, he must have been particularly anxious to extol that noble institution on which, after the death of the Apostles, the spirit

of infallibility was to rest. We marvel how any one who recognizes that God's word in Holy Scripture is infallible, can describe the infallibility of the Church as a "groundless pre-"sumption."[14] Why the scriptures, the human word of God, should be infallible, and the Church, the human work of God, should not be infallible, it is difficult to see. If, owing to the presence of the Spirit of God, the "believing Church," the "house of God" is the bearer of the truth" of the gospel, it is assuredly preserved from "human error." What sort of a "pillar and ground of truth," as the text says, would such a Church be? Must we not, with the Fathers, put to heretics this question: Would Christ allow the whole Church, or the greater part to err and persist in error? Does not a Church that disclaims infallibility snap asunder the bond that links it with the Apostles? "Any system or communion, or self-"called Church which disclaims infallibility, forfeits thereby its "authority over the conscience of its people."[15] Infallibility, then, is not an arrogant assumption, but a matter of life and death for the Church.

9.* Although the infallibility of the Church is closely connected with that of the Apostles, still the distinction between the two must not be overlooked. In the first place the Apostles were the immediate organs of divine revelation. Their main work was to complete and announce to the world the revelation of Christ. They were also inspired by the Holy Spirit to write, as occasion required. Hence, as organs of revelation and first founders of Churches all over the world, they had each the gift of infallibility for himself. Even when they met together in council, it was rather to secure unity in preaching and guiding the Church, than from a dread of not possessing the true Gospel and the Spirit of God. In this respect the position of the Apostolate was unique. But from the very nature of things, the case is different with the success-

14 Tschakert, *Polemik*, p. 21.
15 Manning, *Religio Viatoris*, 2 ed. London 1887, p. 68.

ors of the Apostles. They have only to administer the estate they have inherited. They have to guard the Apostolic deposit, to preach, explain, defend, and develop it according to the needs of each succeeding age. They are witnesses to what they have received from the Apostles; not mechanical witnesses to words and formulas, but living intelligent witnesses. Their office as witness is at once human and divine: human, because the organs and the means employed (research, study) are human; divine because they are appointed or preordained by God, and assisted in their work by the Holy Ghost. For this reason it was not necessary for each individual bishop to be an infallible witness. Nay more, looking at the human side of the Church, we may say that the interests of unity were best served by the gift of infallibility being invested in the Church as a whole, as one organic body. Just as the Apostles, each holding universal jurisdiction, did not impart the same to each bishop, but by appointing a bishop over each town limited his jurisdiction to a definite place, so neither did the gift of personal infallibility attaching to the full Apostolic office pass on to each. In fact, infallibility remained exactly where it was. It was attached to the Apostolic power as such, that is, to him who succeeds to the full Apostolic jurisdiction, that is, to the occupant of the Apostolic See, and to all who by *Missio Apostolica* have a share in his Apostolic power. To say that the Pope is personally infallible, and that the oecumenical council is also infallible is but another way of saying that the Pope is the real successor of an Apostle, and that the Bishops in union with him are the Apostolic succession. Infallibility is a divine gift linked to the Apostolate properly so called. If this were duly borne in mind, half the difficulties raised against it would vanish like a mist.*

II. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH PROVED BY FORMAL TESTIMONY.

10. We now proceed to the *historical* proof for the infalli-

* The translators have deemed it expedient, in the interests of clearness, to amplify the original passage of the author.

bility of the Church. Here two ways are open to us. We may either bring forward testimony from every age to show that the Church has always believed in her own infallibility, or we may prove that she has never erred in faith and morals. The two methods combined will make the proof perfect. Beginning with the early Fathers, we see at once that they are not only careful to point out the necessary condition of infallibility, namely, unbroken Apostolic succession, but that they also affirm directly the gift of infallibility itself. "For to the "Church," says *S. Irenæus*, "is entrusted the light, and consequently the wisdom of God, by which all men are saved. "Everywhere she preaches the truth. She is the seven-branched "candlestick bearing the light of Christ."[16] The Church is the synagogue which God the Son Himself assembled, and united to Himself by the Holy Spirit. To all her doctrines and ordinances the prophets, apostles and disciples all bear witness. "For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and "where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all "grace; but the Spirit is the truth."[17] As of old Jahve dwelt in the midst of his people to teach and assist them, and to give them grace, so now the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church to lead her into all truth, and to enable her to retain possession of it. "If the Spirit were to absent Himself," says S. Chrysostom, "the Church would fall to pieces; but now that she "exists, clearly the Spirit of God is in her."[18] These words are, as it were, a commentary on the famous passage from Irenæus.

Tertullian deduces the Church's infallibility from her unity in doctrine and teaching. Such unity would be impossible without a special gift of the Holy Spirit, as it is most unlikely that a number of Churches would have gone astray in search of one error. "Grant, then, that all have erred; that the Apostle

16 *Adv. Haer.* v. 20. 1.

17 *Ib.* III. 6, 1; 24, 1.

18 *Homil. de S. Pentec.* I 4. See Schell, *Das Wirken des dreieinigen Gottes*, Mainz 1885, p. 531.

"was mistaken in giving his testimony; that the Holy Ghost "had no such respect to any one (Church) as to lead it into "truth, although sent with this view by Christ (John xiv. 26), "and for this asked of the Father that He might be the teacher "of truth (John xv. 26). [Grant also] that He, the Steward of "God, the Vicar of Christ, neglected His office, permitting the "Churches for a time to understand differently, (and) to believe "differently, what He himself was preaching by the Apostles,— "is it likely that so many Churches, and they so great, should "have gone astray into one and the same faith? No casualty "distributed among many men issues in one and the same "result. Error of doctrine in the Churches, must necessarily "have produced various issues. When, however, that which "is deposited among many, is found to be one and the same, "it is not the result of error, but of tradition. Can any one, "then, be reckless enough to say that they were in error who "handed on the tradition?"[19] And *Origen* says: "Hence we "must pay no heed to those who say: 'Lo! here is Christ,' "but show Him not in the Church, which, from the rising "to the setting of the sun, is full of brilliancy and light; which "is a pillar and fortress of truth, in which dwells the Son of "Man who says to all men and all places: 'Behold I am with "'you all days even to the consummation of the world.'" *S. Cyprian* brings out in relief the several parts of the Church when he says: "By the name Church, Christ pointed out that, "even when the proud and stiff-necked multitude of them that "will not obey depart, the Church does not leave Christ; but "the people that gather round the priests (bishops), and the "flock that follow the shepherd are the Church." "That then "is the Catholic Church," says *Lactantius*, "which has the "true worship. She is the fount of life, the home of faith, "the temple of God. They who enter not or go out blight "their hopes of life and eternal salvation."[20]

19 De Praescr. c. 28.
20 Orig., *In Matth.* n. 47. Cypr., *Ep.* 66, 8. Lact., *Instit.* iv. 30.

11. Next we may ask: in what way do the Fathers conceive Infallibility? Do they, perchance, think that the Church "of "the first three centuries triumphed over the many sects simply "with the weapon of the Apostle's Creed, without an infallible "organ?[21] How, then, if the meaning of the Apostle's Creed were itself in question? On the contrary, the Fathers knew nothing of a dead and formal mechanical tradition. They rather call the Church a living institution. They style it the pillar and ground of truth, and the light of Christ. They call to mind that the Holy Spirit works in the Church, and nowhere else. Nay, like S. Cyprian, they couple the names of the bishops, more particularly the Roman bishops, with the promises of Christ. We may ask furthermore, who made the Apostle's Creed, and gave it its standing? How came it to be regarded as a summary of Christian truth? It was a compendium, as we have already shown, of what was believed in the whole Church, and in every Apostolic Church. It was the bishops and no one else who upheld the Creed as an ecclesiastical symbol; who safeguarded unity in truth, and defended the Church against error and heresy, not merely by professing a dead formula, but with the living voice of authority. The creed was professed at baptism—then an Episcopal function,—at which the bishop at least imposed hands, and did the anointing. And thus, apart from the preaching office, the bishop was the watchman and guardian of the Apostolic faith.

Why, too, are Irenæus and Tertullian so urgent in their appeals to the Apostolic succession, but to show that it is the condition on which the divine charisma of truth rests, and that in a living tradition lies the human security that Apostolic teaching has been kept pure? Individual bishops, certainly, were not infallible; but the Church, as the union of bishops and faithful under one head, himself an Apostle, was infallible. If the Apostles themselves, in their lifetime, were an organized body, and the fruit of their labours was conditional on their

21 Hase, p. 26.

mutual union, how much more necessary was this union after their death! Unity and infallibility are inseparable. The latter cleaves to the former as its indispensable condition and subject. If there was one arrow more than another which the great apologists shot with unerring certainty at Gnosticism, it was that the Church as such cannot fall into error. But the Church was represented by the successors of the Apostles in union with one another and with their head. "The ecclesias-"tical preaching," says *Origen*, "has been handed down and "preserved in the Church to this day, by means of the "Apostolic succession." This, then, is according to Origen, the relation in which the bishops stand to the Apostles; they are the vouchers for the safe transmission of Apostolic truth. They are the tradition. This is the rule with which he arms himself against those who think they know what Christ taught, and yet teach doctrines differing in many respects from what they had previously learnt.[22] In this lay the strength of the Catholic Church in her duels with error: that in Apostolic succession she possessed a guarantee that Apostolic truth had been preserved pure and undefiled, and in the consent of the Apostolic Church lay the unerring witness of infallibility. Without the successors of the Apostles this would have been impossible. They, as one solid compact body, were the organs of infallibility.

The Gnostics also appealed to Apostolic tradition, and set up a rule of faith. But the weakness of Gnosticism lay in its "inability either to prove the *public* and *official* character of "its tradition, or to bring it into close connection with the "organization of the Churches."[23] They lacked Church authority which guaranteed infallibility to the whole Church, because it was an authority handed down from the Apostles, and sustained by the Holy Spirit. They lacked, too, the "charisma of truth," bestowed by God on the successors of the Apostles as a security that truth had been preserved and

22 *De Princip.* i. 2. *In Matth.* n. 46
23 Harnack, p. 118 Note 2.

transmitted pure and undiluted.[24] It is a charisma vouschafed only to those who are Christ's. Authority is the decisive element in infallibility; for faith itself, in order to be a rule to our mind, stands in need of authority. Hence *S. Augustine* could say: "I would not believe the Gospel, unless the "authority of the Church moved me thereto." "Moreover, "those who, though they are not within the Catholic unity and "communion, boast of the name of Christians, are compelled "to oppose them that believe, and presume to mislead the "ignorant by a pretence of appealing to reason, since the Lord "came with this remedy above all others, that He enjoined on "the nations the duty of faith. But they are compelled, as I "said, to adopt this policy, because they feel themselves most "miserably overthrown, if their authority is compared with the "Catholic authority. They attempt, accordingly, to prevail "against the firmly-settled authority of the immoveable Church "by the name and the promises of a pretended appeal to "reason. This kind of effrontery is, we may say, characteristic "of all heretics. But He who is the most merciful Lord of "faith, hath both secured the Church in the citadel of authority "by most famous œcumenical councils and the Apostolic Sees "themselves."[25] Catholic truth alone passed as *the* truth.

12. Thus according to the faith of the ancient Church infallibility is linked with authority, and authority belongs to the Apostolic succession, that is to the bishops as one organic body. This being the certain persuasion and consciousness of the Church from the beginning, it would naturally find its chief expression in *General Councils*. There it would assert itself with peculiar force and clearness. And so, indeed, it has. The first Council—that of the Apostles—has become the pattern of all subsequent Councils. "And the Apostles and "ancients assembled to consider of this matter. And when "there had been much disputing, Peter rising up said to

24 Probst, *Disciplin*, p. 33.
25 Aug., *Ep.* 118, 5, 32. (Clark's Transl.)

"them" etc. (Acts XVI. 6. 7). "For as much as we have "heard that some going out from us have troubled you with "words: subverting your souls, *to whom we gave no command-"ment* (οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα). For it hath seemed good to "*the Holy Ghost and to us*, to lay no further burden upon you "than these necessary things." (Acts XVI. 24. 28). (Hase imagines that the Holy Ghost here mentioned is nothing more than the sentiment or the genius of Christianity. In this case it would be wasting words to discuss the infallibility of councils, or any infallibility whatever). S. Cyprian writes in the same strain to Pope Cornelius on the Synod he had held A.D. 252: "It hath seemed good to us under the suggestion of the Holy "Ghost."[26] The Synod of Arles says: "It hath seemed good "to us in the presence of the Holy Spirit and His angels." Constantine called the Synodal decree of Arles a "heavenly "judgment," and he wished priests to respect it as though it "had been drawn up by our Lord Himself.[27] Now it is quite true that in neither of these cases have we to do with a general council, nor does either represent, by itself, the universal agreement of the Church. Cyprian pointedly declared that he had no wish to force his decrees on others. Still, in any case, his words give expression to the conviction that true doctrine is and can be maintained only with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Universal agreement had to be brought about in another way. In the case of the Africans we know exactly how it was effected, namely, by a clear acknowledgement of their union with the Roman See.

The Fathers of Nicæa believed that the Council had spoken in the power of the Holy Spirit, and that it had been convoked by Him to destroy heresies.[28] Constantine says: "What hath "seemed good to the three hundred holy bishops, must be "esteemed as the teaching of the only begotten Son of God."

26 *Epist.* 57, 5.

27 Hefele, *l.c.* i. 24

28 *Athan.*, *ad Afros* c. 5 seq. Basil., *Ep.* 114. 162. Cyrill. Alex., *Ep.* 39. Gregor. Naz.. *Or.* 21, 4.

The Council of Chalcedon formally declared: "We will neither "allow ourselves nor others to overstep by a syllable what our "Fathers at Nicæa decreed. For we are mindful of the words: "Disturb not the landmarks that thy Fathers have set. For "it was not they who spoke, but the Spirit of God Himself."[29] Pope Celestine begins his letter to the Synod of Ephesus with the words: "The Council of bishops bears witness to the "presence of the Holy Spirit."

Speaking of the confession of faith adopted at Chalcedon, Leo the Great says that nothing must be added to a rule drawn up by divine inspiration.[30] Against the Church's judgment, he says, there is no appeal, as it excludes all doubt. God's protection will never be wanting to the Church. Gregory the Great declares that he accepts the four Councils with the same reverence as the four Gospels.[31] Pius IV. calls the Fathers of Trent divinely inspired.

The whole course of procedure at Councils goes to shew that the Church in Council, while fully conscious of the assistance of the infallible Spirit, is also fully aware that it is but a means to aid her to lay down the faith that has been received without addition or diminution. The Council of Chalcedon introduced no innovation into its profession of faith, but affirmed the Catholic principle of Tradition, which recognizes in the general Apostolic belief of the Church the embodiment of revealed truth. As a rule, too, the Councils give direct expression to this continuity of belief. The Fathers of Chalcedon declare that they affirm anew the true faith of the Fathers against heretics; that they promulgate the creed professed by three hundred and eighteen bishops at Nicæa, which the one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople, who accepted it, regarded as their own. "While receiving the ordinances and decrees "regarding faith made by the former Synod of Ephesus under

29 Mansi, *Concil. Coll.* vi. 672.
30 *Epist.* 18, 1. Leo. *Ep.* 102, 2; 120, 4; 162, 1. 3. See Hefele, i. 56 seq.
31 *Ep.* i. 25 (12). Cf. *Corp. Jur.* i. Dist. xv. c. 2.

"Celestine and Cyril, we decree that the declaration of the "three hundred and eighteen Fathers at Nicæa should be as a "lamp to the true and spotless faith, and that the decree "drawn up by one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople, "in defence of the Catholic and Apostolic faith, be still "binding." Moreover, they declare that they expand the decrees of former synods, not because they thought them insufficient, but merely to meet the attacks of heretics.[32] After the formula had been read aloud, the Fathers shouted out with one voice: "This is the faith of the Fathers, and of the "Apostles. To it we all assent. Such is the faith we profess." Again S. Vincent of Lerins says: To avoid innovations the Council of Ephesus adopted the best and most faithful and Catholic course, viz. to bring to light the teaching of the holy Fathers, some of whom were martyrs, others confessors, and all holy priests, in order that by proceeding in an orderly and solemn fashion, the sanctity of the ancient faith might be strengthened by their unanimous decision, and the blasphemies of profane innovators condemned.[33] To say that the Church may decide questions that cannot be answered with certainty from the sources of faith, is not a new doctrine and in contradiction to the teaching of the Fathers.[34] Nor is "a direct divine inspiration" necessary. Of course the Church's teaching office was not ordained for merely settling what among Catholics are called "theological controversies," but for giving decisions in matters of faith, which are based upon the authority of Scripture and Tradition. General Councils were instituted by the Apostles, and were the best means for voicing correctly the faith of all the Apostolic Churches, and for bearing witness to Apostolic teaching. Still we must beware of conceiving this act of bearing witness as a mechanical process. It is not the act of a moment, but the fruit of much care and labour. Were the

32 Mansi, vii. 107. Hefele, II. 468. 473.
33 *Commonit.* c. 29.
34 Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, p. 109.

matter so easy and so simple, the long sessions would be unnecessary, and the heated debates with heretics unintelligible. The bishops could not guard and declare an old article of faith, except by explaining and defining it more closely. Hence they are not mechanical witnesses of the faith handed down, but living intelligent witnesses, doctors and bearers of the charisma of truth. "For this reason those in the Church 'must obey the priests who are the successors of the Apostles, "who, with the succession of the Episcopate have, according "to the decree of the Father, received the sure gift of truth."[35]

13. This gift, however, did not confer infallibility on every individual pre-ordained witness [bishop]. Therefore it was quite possible that such Fathers as Athanasius, Augustine and others, while holding that the Church was certainly infallible, were not agreed as to the precise form and condition in which infallibility manifested itself. Hence arose the disputes in regard to Councils. How was their authority to be measured? Not simply by the number of bishops present. There were other conditions requisite. Augustine begins by setting Holy Scripture above the writings of bishops, because its authority was above the realm of dispute. But the writings of bishops, if they deflect from the truth, may be censured by those who have greater knowledge or authority, by learned bishops, or by councils. He contrasts provincial councils with plenary synods summoned from the whole Christian world, and assigns to these latter a higher rank. But even among these last, he thinks, the later are often an improvement on the earlier, since experience opens out what was closed, or discloses what was hidden.[36] But neither this phrase nor Gregory Nazianzen's depreciatory statement on the human strife in vogue at synods[37] can be twisted into an argument against the infallibility either of the Church or of general synods.[38] For Gregory was

35 Irenæus III. 24, 1.
36 *De Bapt.* II. 3.
37 *Epist.* 130 (al. 55).
38 Hase, p. 18.

speaking, not of synods generally, but of those which he had seen. And in a certain sense he was right. For, as a result, evils, instead of being dissipated, thickened. So, likewise, Augustine had in view merely the African synods held with regard to baptism by heretics. Else he could not have said that later plenary councils had often improved on earlier. For, at that time, there were only two general councils, and of these two one, that at Constantinople, obtained universal recognition only by slow degrees. Thus there remains only the one that touched upon the question of heretical baptism, the œcumenicity of which, on closer inspection, collapsed. That Augustine supposed that no œcumenical council had dealt with the question is clear from his words: "Nor should "we ourselves venture to assert anything of the kind, were we "not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole "Church—to which he [Cyprian] would unquestionably have "yielded, if at that time the truth of this question had been "placed beyond dispute by the investigation and decree of a "general council." Then he goes on to give the reason why this could not happen: "For how could a matter which was "involved in such mists of disputation ever have been brought "to the full illumination and authoritative decision of a general "council, had it not first been known to be discussed for some "considerable time in the various districts of the world, with "many discussions and comparisons of the views of the bishops "on every side? But this is one effect of the soundness of "peace, that when any doubtful points are long under investi-"gation, and when on account of the difficulty of arriving at "the truth, they produce difference of opinion in the course of "brotherly disputation, till men at last arrive at the unalloyed "truth, yet the *bond of unity* remains, lest in the part that is "cut away, there should be found the incurable wound of "deadly error."[39]

In these words the great doctor has furnished us with his

39 *L. c.* c. iv. (Clark's Transl.) Also c. xv.

complete view of the nature and character of councils. For the rest, the plenary council which actually brought the controversy to an end,[40] was not a General Council, as Augustine knew and expressly states. For, he says, Cyprian would not have been content with a plenary African Synod under Agrippinus, if he could have appealed to a transmarine or general (*universale*) Council for this object. Whether the general council referred to was that of Niceæa or the Synod of Arles, is a disputed point;[41] but probably it was the latter. Further on he adds: "Cyprian, indeed, says that on this subject not "one but two or more councils were held; always, however, "in Africa. For, indeed, in one he mentions that seventy-one "bishops had been assembled, to all whose authority we do "not hesitate, with all due deference to Cyprian, to prefer the "authority, supported by many more bishops, of the whole "Church spread throughout the whole world, of which Cyprian "himself rejoiced that he was an inseparable member."[42]

14. Nor, in point of fact have General Councils ever contradicted previous councils. The bishops at the Second Council of Constantinople (553 A.D.) put to themselves the objection that a condemnation of the three chapters [i.e. the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuesta, the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas to Maris, a Persian] would involve a breach with the Council of Chalcedon. The condemnation that followed was so construed by many. And even to this day, Protestant controversialists regard it in that light.[43] It was, they say, "a condemnation of the faith of "two highly respected Fathers, long since dead, of the Eastern "Church, whom the Council of Chalcedon had pronounced "orthodox. Thus the decree of one oecumenical council is "placed in formal contradiction with the decree of another. "The condemnation, they allow, affected only persons and

40 *De Bapt.* ii. chapters vii.-ix. (Clark's Transl.)

41 Hefele, i. 202. See also Note in Clark's Transl: of Aug., *de Bapt.* l. ii. cap. ix.

42 *De Bapt.* iii. c. x. 14. (Clark's Tr.)

43 Hase, p. 19. Strauss, *Glaubenslehre*, i. 116.

"writings, but they stood in immediate relation to a dogma.' The two men alluded to are Theodoret and Ibas. For on the third concerned in the Three Chapters controversy, namely Theodore, the Council of Chalcedon had made no declaration. The objection made at Constantinople seemed plausible enough; still it was overruled. For, at Chalcedon, Theodoret and Ibas had, in person, cleared themselves of all suspicion of Nestorianism. Consequently they were re-instated in their Sees. Still, in so acting the Council by no means set a seal of approbation either on their former conduct or writings. "The "Fifth Council merely passed judgment on the past, without "in the least disputing the award of Chalcedon, and the "re-instatement of the two bishops. What was done at "Constantinople might have been done at Chalcedon, without "the least clash of contradiction. The decision of the Fifth "Council was objective . . . The most that can be said "is that it is at variance with the votes of some few members "of the Council of Chalcedon."[44]

15. Nor does the alleged contradiction between the Council of Constance and the Fifth Lateran Council fare better. The former declared that a General Council is superior to the Pope, the latter that the Pope is above a General Council. But the controversy as to the oecumenicity of the Council of Constance, or of certain of its sessions, is still in full swing; and it will hardly be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Still, granting its oecumenical character, surely it can only be oecumenical in the sense in which it was confirmed by Martin V. and Eugenius IV. Now these Popes were particularly careful not to give it a general confirmation. They do not, indeed, say point blank which decrees are not included in the approbation. "But it is clear that both exclude from their approbation those "decrees which trench on the authority and rights of the Holy "See, that is, the decrees in sessions three to five."[45] It is

44 Hefele, ii. 906.

45 Hefele, i. 61; vii. 104. 367. Funk, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 340, Note 1. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte*, iii. 557.

not right, therefore, from a mere Gallican view, to allege these, to say the least, doubtful decrees against the infallibility of the Church, and thus create a formal opposition to the Lateran Council. Anyhow, the entire Western Church subsequently espoused the cause of the Lateran, thus accepting Martin the Fifth's reservation.

The infallibility of the Council coincides with the infallibility of the Church. Hence only those Councils can rank as general, which are of the whole Church as such, or which by common consent were raised to this dignity. In the last instance the decision on this point must rest, not with science, but with the Church. In this sense we can accept the statement that "a certain number of Synods, though differently assorted in the "Eastern and Roman Churches, gradually acquired unqualified "authority throughout the whole Catholic Church, because by "a sort of *inward necessity*, they caused a *definite train of ideas* "in regard to the nature of the God-Man to be recognized; "so that each subsequent Synod had first to establish its own "orthodoxy, by an unqualified acceptance of the Synodal "decrees that had preceded it."[46] We have italicised the phrases "*inward necessity*," and "*definite train of ideas*," as a testimony to the fact that Synods are dominated by the spirit of truth, not by caprice, and that they are in harmony with each other. Not theological hair-splitting but the deepmost general needs of Christian faith and life were the springs that set Synods in motion. And the result was that traditional doctrine was preserved unscathed, and expounded in its purity.

16. Were Councils to be judged merely by their outward composition, the verdict would, indeed, often be doubtful. "The bishops assembled at Ariminum and Seleucia [A.D. 359] "trebled in number those at the Council of Nicæa; and yet "their decrees were set aside, because they were not in "harmony with the "*definite train of ideas*." Yet the majority of bishops at Ariminum had previously re-affirmed the Nicene

46 Hase, p. 19.

faith, and outlawed the Arian leaders. They had not the faintest suspicion that the Arians were attaching a double meaning to obvious words; for they did not believe hat priests would stoop to such trickery.[47] When the Arian bishop Maximin appealed to the formula accepted by the three hundred and thirty bishops at Ariminum, Augustine replied: "Refer me not to writings that are not at hand to examine, "or that have no binding force."[48] As to the Synod of Seleucia, dissensions among its members broke it up before any definite decision had been reached. At last, none but the Emperor had his way. So, notwithstanding the large number of bishops, a General Council is, in this case, out of the question. Again, the course taken by the Arian controversy shows that it was the Church's infallibility and not merely the "inward necessity of a definite train of ideas" that triumphed. For, these may be a necessary logical sequence in error, viewed merely in its formal aspect. But in the Christian Church there is logical connection, because it holds the deposit of material truth.

17. Nor does the Latrocinium of Ephesus (449 A.D.) alter the aspect of affairs. Even had there been no sudden change of Emperor, Leo the Great would have taken care that it would never have been raised to the dignity of a General Council. Worldly motives and influences have, it is true, been at work even in General Councils; but the subsequent attitude of the Church, long after the influences had been dead and buried, clearly showed on which side the Church and truth stood. The Synod of Constantinople (754 A.D.), composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, styled itself œcumenical; but it was not general in its representatives, nor was it generally recognized. The force of its decree against images was mea-ured exactly by the length of the secular arm. Eastern patriarchs, outside the empire, equally with the Roman

47 Hieron, *Adv. Lucif.* n. 19.
48 *Coll. c. Max.* n. 4.

Church, declared against it; and the Lateran Council of 769 went so far as to lay it under anathema.[49] The authority of General Councils will remain unimpaired, so long as there is nothing better to set against them than such Provincial Councils. They are a standing eloquent testimony to Christian belief in the Church's infallibility. To them we owe the preservation of unity.

The *authority* of the Church has ever been paramount and decisive in this as in other matters. The decree of Gregory the Great on the five General Councils hitherto held[50] was embodied in the Canon Law.[51] So likewise the profession of faith to be taken on oath by a new pope, which at the end of the ninth century recognized eight oecumenical Councils. For Councils held in the middle ages, Papal approbation was an understood thing, since, as a rule, they were held in Rome either under the presidency or supervision of the pope.

18. Naturally, at the time of the Schism and the Reform-Councils, many learned men let fall phrases that were aimed against the authority of Pope and Councils. But such isolated expressions were too evidently the result of the depressing situation of the times to shake the principle of infallibility. Peter d'Ailly, who from his intimate relations with Benedict XIII. and John XXIII., and his connection with the Synods of Pisa and Constance, had learnt and felt the consequences of the Schism, in order to frame more peaceful regulations for pretenders to the papacy, thought it necessary to deny the infallibility of general councils.[52] Nevertheless, he decided that councils were superior to the pope, changed his opinion as to the right and manner of voting, and his attitude to John XXIII., veered round like a weathercock so often, that he cannot be allowed to pass muster as a competent witness against infallibility. "He often jumbles different views together without

49 Hefele, iii. 410. 429. 438.

50 *Epist.* 25. *Decret. I. Dist.* xv. c. 1.

51 *Dist.* xvi. 6. 8. See Schwane, *l. c.* III. 514.

52 *Kirchenlexicon*, 2 ed. I: 371.

"discrimination; e.g., in regard to the origin of the primacy, "where he gives it as his view that the authority of the Roman "Church is derived *principaliter* from Christ, and *secundario* "from the Council." By this, too, we may measure his other dictum: "According to some great doctors a general council "can err, not only in matters of fact, but also in law, and what "is more in faith. To the universal Church alone belongs the "privilege that it cannot err in faith."[53] And still more strange is his appeal to Luke XXII. 32 as proving his thesis. In like manner Nicholas of Cusa changed his attitude towards the Council of Basle and the Holy See as circumstances dictated.

The saying of S. Antoninus of Florence, if it be at all genuine, proves nothing against the general teaching of the Saint and the Church. It, too, must be explained by circumstances. Amid the convulsions that marked the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries, it was not always easy, even for a Saint, to discern which was right. He says: "Even the Council can err. For although a General Council "acts for the whole Church, still it is not the whole Church, "but only represents it. Hence it is possible for the faith to "be preserved in some individual; in which case, it may be "said with truth, that the faith of the Church does not fail. "This was clearly the case in Christ's passion, when faith had "died out except in the Virgin Mary's breast; for all others "were scandalized. And yet Christ had prayed for Peter that "his faith might never fail."[54] That Antoninus was actuated by zeal for the Church is well known. Thus he writes to his nephew, Giovanni, *à propos* of the election of Calixtus III.: "We must always think well of the Holy Father, and judge "His measures in a kindly spirit, more so than in the case of "any other living person. Nor should we take scandal at every

53 Hardt, *Const. Conc.* Tom. II. p. 200. Hase, p. 20. Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3 ed. II. 674.

54 *Summa doct.* p. iii. Tit. 23. c. 2, 6. Hase, p. 21. See *Civ. Cattol.* Ser. vii. vol. v. p. 52, and vol. ix. p. 304. 573. 709, where the passage is treated as an interpolation. According to the account of the Marquis Palermo the code of San Marco in Florence justifies the suspicion of interpolation.

"trifle. Christ steers Peter's bark, and hence it can never "sink. At times, during the storm, Christ seems to slumber. "But, then, when there is need we must awake Him with "prayer and good works."[55] These and such like isolated expressions, therefore, may seem to approximate to the Protestant view; still they cannot throw into the shade the Catholic faith of these illustrious men. Forerunners of the Reformation they most certainly were not.

19. The Middle Ages looked at the Church much more from within than from without. The indefectibility of faith as existing in the hearts of the faithful was the doctrine chiefly emphasized. And it was viewed in its effects, for no one denied the cause. Nevertheless this one-sided view tended to obscure the Church's active infallibility, and thus in part prepared the way for its denial. The tendency inaugurated by Occam, Marsilius of Padua, and John of Jandun, had broken the ground for the designs of Wiclif and Hus, and had in many respects shaken the authority of the Church to its foundation; but the consequence of that movement went beyond the question of infallibility. A strenuous defender of Church authority and infallibility appeared in the person of Cardinal John Torquemada, who assisted at the Councils of Constance, Basle and Florence.[56]

20. The appeal made by the Reformers to a General Council against the pope's decision was dictated by the same spirit that had been endeavouring for a century to set up General Councils in opposition to the pope. But the appeal still proceeded on the assumption that General Councils could infallibly decide controversies of faith. When Luther first entered on his crusade against the doctrines and discipline of the Church, he was most unwilling to challenge the authority of the Catholic Church. He passed as one struggling against abuses that were rampant in the Church. He took his stand

55 Reumont, *Briefe heiliger und gottesfürchtiger Italiener*, Frieburg 1877, p. 144.

56 *Summa de ecclesia*. Venet. 1561. See Scheeben, *Dogmatik* i. 101. Schwane, iii. 499. 805.

on the authority of General Councils, till, in the disputation at Leipzig, he was driven into a corner by the decrees of the Council of Constance against Hus.[57] Hence there was no need for the Council of Trent to draw up a formal definition of the infallibility of the Council, as it was taken for granted. Moreover it was also clearly affirmed in the introduction to the several sessions. And being unwilling to kindle the flame of controversy within the Church's pale, it is easy to understand why the Council avoided the delicate topic of the relation in which the Holy See stands to the Council. But the Roman Catechism was unshackled by such considerations. Being an instruction to priests, it taught infallibility pure and simple. "As this one Church cannot err in teaching faith or morals, "because she is guided by the Holy Spirit; so all others, "who arrogate to themselves the name Church, being guided "by the spirit of the devil, must fall into most pernicious "errors of faith and morals."[58]

21. Were the Reformers, perchance, when battling against the Church's infallibility, disposed to relinquish their own? Or were not their efforts to accentuate their own in direct proportion to the vehemence with which they denounced hers? Calvin at Geneva and Luther in Wittenberg anathematized all who ventured to tilt against their doctrines. Imitating S. Paul, Luther writes: "There is not an angel in heaven, let "alone a man on earth, who has either the ability or the "presumption to correct my teaching. He that receiveth it "not cannot be saved, and he that believeth any other is "doomed to hell."[59] "Luther's whole life and career were "dominated by two fixed ideas: that the pope is antichrist, "that his own doctrine was specially revealed to him by God, "and that it alone profited unto salvation."[60] The formal principle which erected Holy Scripture into the one rule of

57 See Möhler, q. 330. Funk, p. 393. Janssen, *Geschichte*, etc. ii. 83.
58 P. i. c. 13. q. 16. See Bellarm. T. ii. l. ii. *de concil. auctorit.*
59 *Werke*, Wittenb. Edit. ii. 49. Erlanger Ed. 28. 144.
60 Janssen, l. c. p. 83. Hase, p. 2.

faith apparently secured to the faithful full freedom of enquiry in matters of faith. But Luther, by declaring justification by faith alone the leading fundamental principle [material rule of faith], made himself the infallible authority for all his followers. Had the Catholic Church accepted this condition, Luther would never have left her. This, of course, would have meant that she would forswear her own infallibility and history for fifteen centuries, in favour of the supposititious infallibility of an individual who could show neither warrant nor credentials. By saying that "God had led him like a blind horse," he virtually admitted that no proof of his divine mission was forthcoming. It may perhaps be more correct to say that the Reformers "plucked the eternal justice of their idea from "heaven," and thus defied the rights of the Church that had been consecrated by centuries; but then the idea was their own, not the Holy Spirit's.

The material rule of faith, established by Luther, which destroys all free enquiry root and branch, becomes henceforth the principle *stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*. And yet it contradicts the express declaration of Holy Scripture, or at most rests on the one-sided interpretation of just one passage (Rom. III. 28). Symbolic confessions, again, can have no binding force, except in so far as they emanate from an infallible authority. The *formula concordiae* not only rejects all errors that are broached against the three creeds—the Apostle's, the Nicene, and the Athanasian—but also adopts the unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcaldic Articles, and Luther's two Catechisms. "Every doctrine in religion is to be made con- "formable to the model just now explained; everything opposed "to it must be rejected and anathematized, as contradicting "this united declaration of our faith."[61] Any one who knows how this *formula concordiae* was hatched, will not be tempted to barter the infallibility of Trent for that of its authors. And

61 *P. I. Proem.* III. 6. p. 570.

yet, till quite recently, this formula was binding on Protestant theologians.

Hence it is not true that the Reformers referred each one to his own heart as prompted by the Holy Spirit, and to Scripture; it is not true that they left the interpretation of Scripture to science; least of all is it true that they denied the infallibility of every existing Church, although such denial is implied in their cardinal principle, which declares that the ideal Church or perfect Christianity was not contained in any of the historical churches.[62] This last idea grew up in the nineteenth century, not in the sixteenth. Luther was never minded to concede that the Catholic Church—"the Babylonian whore," as he called her—was a branch of the true Church. On the contrary, the more he was bloated with hatred of Rome, and drifted into Dogmatism, the more he was convinced, at least so he said, that he was establishing the true Church of Christ. For this reason Bunsen designates Lutheranism as "that unhappy, "unhistorical, unphilosophical . . . . untheological and "unevangelical dogmatism into which Luther, in the latter part "of his life, was in a measure driven, to his own and Melanc-"thon's chagrin,—a dogmatism that Lutheran Scholastics "subsequently developed and tried to build up into a Con-"fession." That the ideal Church is, in a certain sense, never realized here on earth, goes without saying. But the idea of her Founder, that she was to be the infallible medium of divine revelation, must have been realized by the Christian Church from the beginning. The human organs on which the Church depends prevent her from fully realizing the ideal. Yet, however great and manifold her imperfections, error in faith is not one of them. The Holy Spirit who guides and directs the human organs of the Church, assures her of the infallible possession of truth.

22. But even apart from the compulsory symbolic confessions and the material principle of faith, it must at all events

62 Hase, p. 36. Bunsen, *Die Zeichen der Zeit*, 1855, II. 132.

be conceded that orthodox Protestants of the old school believed in the infallibility of the letter of Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture was set forth as the one and only judge, standard and rule for testing all dogmas. The Creeds were regarded merely as explanatory witnesses of the faith. This belief in the creeds, so thinks Hase, and a Catholic's belief in the infallibility of his Church, are to be equally subjective. "Still "there is a difference. Protestantism, by abandoning the "supernatural or rather unnatural doctrine of inspiration, "entered on a higher course of development; but if the "Catholic Church renounces infallibility, she must renounce "herself. For without it she ceases to be the perfect Church "blending the ideal with the real, and she has no right to "demand an unconditional submission of conscience."[63] Is it at all likely that the Catholic Church will prove as pliant in renouncing infallibility, as modern Protestantism is in rejecting not only this, but every other view of inspiration?

Men are now debating in what way they may still profess belief in the teaching authority of the Bible. With a flourish of trumpets it is proclaimed, as one of the discoveries of science, that the doctrine of the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible in detail is untenable.[64] They who hold these views may certainly appeal to Luther, who uses language in regard to the Prophets that is utterly incompatible with the doctrine of inspiration. Nor is this all. It should not be forgotten that Luther rejected entire books of the Old Testament as uncanonical, because they tallied not with his doctrine of justification. Thus he set his own authority and infallibility on a higher pedestal than that of Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture can never, indeed, be wholly stripped of its supernatural character. Even to those who neither believe its infallibility, nor admit an infallible interpreter, it may offer some kind of comfort and instruction, but cannot offer any

63 Hase, p. 39.

64 P. 79. *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1877. N. 24. Coll. 577. Döllinger, p. 422. *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1884. p. 356. Röhm, *Confessionelle Gegensätze* iii. 47.

certainty of faith. With the rejection of its divine authority the floodgates of doubt and unbelief are opened. As human nature without authority would never have reached manhood; as parents and tutors are necessary for a child's education, so the religious education of a people and of the human race at large is impossible without a living infallible authority. Facts, as every one knows, are stronger than theories. The entire history of religion testifies that authority is a necessity, and the history of Protestantism goes far to confirm its verdict. The rejection of the Church's infallible authority has been prolific in appalling consequences. "The subjec- "tivity," says a Protestant critic, "that makes Christianity "consist in the doctrine that each one must follow his own "conscience, is an excrescence of Calvinism. Pietism, with "its materialistic notion of conversion, grew out of Luther's one-sidedness. Protestantism wavers "between unbelief and belief in chimeras." Febronius, Dr. Blau, Joseph II., and the German bishops at the close of last century must, we suppose, be reckoned as hostile to the infallibility of the Catholic Church. Still, how flimsy and paltry is this tradition when set against the testimony of a long line of scholarly, saintly and illustrious men of all ages, from the days of Ignatius, Irenæus, and Augustine to our own time! Whether Erasmus believed in it or not; whether or no the "liberal minded historian de "Thou," as Hugo Grotius says, remained Catholic with "thirty "exceptions"; whether many Catholics were or were not in their inmost hearts in love with the doctrine—all this is beside the purpose. It cannot decide nor even influence for a moment the question of principle. With such methods of inquiry, how would Protestants establish their belief in the infallibility of Scripture? in justification by faith alone? or in the divinity of Jesus? Was Christ not infallible, because the Jews did not believe? Did S. Paul not preach the true Gospel, because he was everywhere persecuted by the Judaizing section? We may, however, set our minds at rest on this

score, as we can say with reason that the overwhelming majority of Catholics still have a deep belief in the truth of the Gospel and the infallibility of the Church.

III. MATERIAL PROOF FOR THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY.

23. In the preceding pages we have given a full and formal proof for the doctrine of the Church's infallibility from Holy Scripture, Tradition, and History. There is yet another way of demonstrating the same truth, namely from actual facts. Can it, then, be shown that the Church, as a matter of fact, has never erred? In order to answer this question, we must, in the first place, refer the reader to chapter I. For the question as to the Church's infallibility has no meaning except for such as acknowledge in Christianity an infallible revelation; and then it reduces itself to this: Has the Church guarded with fidelity and interpreted correctly the deposit of revelation? But who is to be the arbiter to decide the point? The individual judgment cannot be accepted as referee in this any more than in the formal proof. When, however, we see the entire Catholic Church in the second, third, fourth and following centuries loudly declaring that she teaches nothing but what she has received as Apostolic truth, and what is in agreement with Holy Scripture, we have surely the greatest security that can, humanly speaking, be expected. With regard to the Arian and Christological controversies, which were decided by the old Councils, the Reformers, as we have already remarked, admit the fact and quite agree with Catholics. In what, then, does the error of the Old Church consist?

24. The doctrine of the *Millenium*,* which is said to have found wide acceptance in the Christian Church in the second and third centuries, is sometimes referred to as a case in point.

* That is, the opinion which holds that before the general resurrection the just will rise first and be gathered round Christ on earth in the city of Jerusalem, and will reign with Him for a thousand years. The opinion seems to have originated with Papias and was confined to Asiatic writers. For a full historical and theological examination of the question, see Franzelin, *De Div. Trad.* Thesis xvi. Tr.

But in its crude form as an earthly sensual kingdom, lasting for a thousand years, it was far from obtaining general credence. In its ideal form, as belief in the near approach of Christ's second coming, and the beginning of the eternal kingdom, it was certainly widespread. Still it furnishes no argument against the Church's infallibility. Surely our Lord Himself said that neither the angels in heaven, nor even the Son of Man knows the day and the hour. S. Paul believed that Christ's coming was near at hand, and pointed out certain signs that are to precede it. Hence the Fathers often thought that they detected these signs. If God, in His infinite wisdom, has been pleased to conceal the time in order to compel men to be always on the watch, there could be no error in faith, if Christendon often thought the moment close at hand.

25. The next and perhaps chief instance alleged against infallibility is the *constitution* of the Church, as involving episcopacy and primacy. But, in the eyes of Catholics, this is not a departure from truth. Only Protestants, and some Easterns, so regard it. Catholics, as we have already seen, and shall see again later on, are able to appeal with good reason both to Scripture and to a chain of Tradition that stretches back to the second century.

26. Again, the Reformers contended, and many Protestants still maintain, that in the middle ages the Church became Pelagian. But proof for this statement is not forthcoming either from the writings of theologians, or from the lives of Christians during that period. Impartial Protestants undisguisedly admit that religious life developed even at that time in an ascending and not in a descending scale. Instead of contrasting mediæval piety with that of the so-called precursors of the Reformation, they concede that the piety of the Middle Ages was quite different from what the Reformers had conceived it. Their doctrine of justification by faith alone, and of the worthlessness and sinfulness of good works is a downward leap from the entire belief of antiquity. No one will ever dream of making

this a landmark in the development of ecclesiastical doctrine. Here we neither have Apostolic doctrine unchanged, nor a logical development therefrom, but a formal change. Even if infallibility consists merely in "victoriously defending, under "a divine shield, the doctrine handed down by the Apostles "against all innovations; in successfully guarding it against "misunderstandings and misinterpretations, and in preserving it to the end of time without change or increase or diminution,"[65] the Protestant doctrine of justification could lay no claim to this protecting shield.

27. Hence Hase's contention is thoroughly inaccurate. "Forsaken alike by Holy Scripture and a firm Tradition, the "Church's infallibility is at last made to rest on the philosophi-"cal basis of its supposed necessity. Christ must, forsooth, "have instituted a sure and certain means of defining the "true sense of the Bible, of deciding all controversies of faith, "and of safeguarding the unity of the Church. Now this "means can only be a supreme ecclesiastical board, exempt "from all error, issuing in God's name infallible decrees, to "which all who wish to be saved must submit. The Church "must be free from error, for the faithful trusting in her "cannot be led astray."[66]

"*Forsaken by Holy Scripture!*" Yes, if modern Protestants are privileged with infallibility in interpreting Scripture, and are free to explain away the plain and obvious sense of all the passages we have adduced. Those modern Protestants, too, who more or less give up inspiration, and sacrifice Christ's divinity along with the Apostles' Creed! Strange to say, the older Protestants thought otherwise, and so did the Reformers, who appealed to Holy Scripture precisely in order to prove the universal infallibility of all believers. In combating the infallibility of the Catholic Church, they were far from denying their own, or that of Holy Scripture, or their own infallible interpre-

65 Langen, *l.c.* p. 28.

66 P. 39. See Möhler, p. 336.

tation of Holy Scripture. Nay, they claimed it with all the more vehemence. But orthodox Protestants are even now constrained to admit the infallibility of that "Church whose "essential constitutive principle lies in the Holy Spirit of God," because they would otherwise be in too glaring contradiction with Christ's infallible truth.

28. "*Abandoned by a firm Tradition!*" In spite of S. Augustine's saying that any reasonable man, in doubt as to where to look for the true religion, would go forthwith and enquire at the Catholic Church, which is as ancient as the days of the Apostles, and is the most widespread! Catholics, he thought, need not be afraid of puny sects. Many heresies have already passed away. Like brooklets they run their little course as long as they can; but they have ceased to flow; they are dried up; and their very names have vanished. Augustine enumerates eighty-eight such heresies, Theodoret seventy-six, and Bellarmine two hundred. So completely, he says, are they effaced from memory that not merely themselves, but even their books, doctrines and names, yea all traces beyond such references as are found in Catholic works, have vanished. Abandoned by Tradition! Yes, if exceptions, and very rare exceptions, upset instead of proving a rule, and if a doctrinal system hedged round with precise formulæ is demanded at the outset. With the early Christians belief in the Church's infallibility was identical with belief in the perennial infallibility of Christianity. But in the Apologists of the second century, and in the later Fathers, reflexion developed this belief into conscious conviction. Even the frightful havoc and confusion created by Arianism could not shake this conviction in the Church's infallibility and indefectibility. S. Jerome, who had observed that the world was astonished to find that after the synod of Seleucia-Rimini, it had become Arian, goes on to say: "The barque of the Apostles was in danger. The winds "and waves beat against it on all sides. All hope had fled. "[But] the Lord is awakened, and calms the storm. The beast

"dies, and peace returns." The prophecies about the universal Church have, he says, become true. "Where, I ask, are those "men, too pious to be profane, and too profane to be pious. "who contend that there are more synagogues than Churches? "How the strongholds of the devil have been battered down! "and how, at the end, that is, in the fulness of time, idols will "be lopped down!"[68] In the West, Ambrose could not find more than two hotbeds of heresy. "As far as the ocean, in "every direction, in every province and in every house there "floats the one unsullied banner of faith." In the East, he notes with gladness, after the Arians had been driven forth from the churches, which they had violently invaded, none but Catholics frequented them. Could there be a more living and deeper conviction that the Catholic Church was both infallible and insuperable? Could these Fathers have possibly thought that the whole Church, as represented in General Councils, could fall into error?

The infallibility of the Catholic Church was, it is true, challenged by Wiclif and Hus, Calvin, Zwingli and Luther. Does, perchance, the "firm tradition" begin here? Did they not call in question many other doctrines which are now regarded even by their own supporters in a different light? Do their explanations of most important passages of Holy Scripture still hold good with the majority of Protestants? Is it wonderful that men who cut themselves adrift from the Church, should strike a blow at her infallibility? or that, in an age glutted with rationalistic tendencies, some Catholic scholars and even bishops were drawn into rejecting it? No one will be surprised at this who reflects that many other truths, undoubtedly contained in Holy Scripture, were then slaughtered as a hecatomb at the shrine of the Moloch of Rationalism. There is no proof from Scripture and Tradition for the favourite theory that God was pleased so to shape the course of history,

68 Hieron., *Adv. Lucif.* n. 19, 15. Ambros., *Ep.* 12, 3. Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 57, 16. Bellarm., *l. c.* 4, 6.

that the Spirit of Jesus was to lead Christendom into all truth only by slow degrees and through many dark and tortuous windings. To say that the several rival confessions approximate more or less nearly to the ideal Church at which we are aiming,[69] means either that the earlier confessions must be set down as defective, or that the latter are a mere human effort. Both are in contradiction with the idea of Christianity set forth in Scripture, and in vogue in the ancient Church. Both rob faith of its sure and infallible basis.

29. "*Made to rest on the philosophical basis of its supposed necessity.*" What have we to say in regard to this third charge? We must, indeed, plead guilty. There is, we confess, a clearly reasonable basis for the infallibility of the Church. There is, we admit, a necessity. Möhler has given prominence to this side of the proof in his beautiful and spirited treatise. But he was not the first in the field. The Fathers likewise had taken it for granted. They looked upon it as an immediate consequence of the promise that Christ and the Holy Spirit would abide in the Church to the end of time. Why should not such a necessity be admitted to lie at the basis of divine wisdom and goodness? Ancient philosophers claimed a sort of necessity for civil government because man, as an *animal sociale*, has certain duties to his superiors and inferiors. As a rule the civil and religious order went hand in hand, when they were not wholly blent in one. Even the Greeks, famed for their toleration, in their state policy made belief in the gods a necessity, and punished atheists with death. Now if, in Christianity, absolute truth has been given for all ages, is it unreasonable to assume that in this religious society established by God Himself, there should be a similar necessity corresponding to its absolute character? Is it senseless to believe that God has made provision for revelation to be handed down infallibly to all men, of all ages and climes, to profit them unto salvation? The Church's end and aim, and the essential nature of faith, are equally

69 Kohler, *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1888. Nr. 3. col. 62.

clamorous in demanding an infallible, visible authority on earth. A few words will suffice to shew this.

The fabric of Christianity rests wholly on the person of Christ, the God-Man. The value of the work of redemption and man's salvation hang on belief in His person. Every error relative to the person of Christ exerts a more or less restraining influence on the piety and virtue of His disciples. Right knowledge, on the other hand, provides a deep foundation for saintliness of life. In like manner a clear consciousness of Christ's work will bring forth the richest and finest fruit; whilst distorted notions about it, on any point whatever, are sure to be attended with many backslidings in practical life."[70] Is, then, the conclusion merely philosophical, that belief in the person of Christ has not been left exposed to "every wind "of doctrine?" Allowing that man is neither "feather-broom "nor wind-bag,"[71] still, according to S. Paul, the security against shipwreck in religion, lies precisely in the institution of an infallible Church. "That we may not now be children, "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of "doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness, by which "they lie in wait to deceive." (Ephes. iv. 14). The history of Christianity teems with the aberrations of men who suffered themselves to be tossed to and fro by every wind. Without the infallibility of the Church, self-conscious science and worldly libertinism would long since have defaced Christianity beyond recognition. Infallibility follows so necessarily from the ideas of an infallible Christ and an absolute revelation, that the only question is where to find it. Modern Protestants, who hold that each fraction of a Church is lit up by broken rays from the one light of Christian truth, and who seek to focus these broken rays in an ideal Church in the distant future, may renounce all claim to it; but the Catholic Church has ever lived in the conviction that Jesus dwells in her with His Spirit, to guard her from all error in faith.

70 Möhler, p. 339. Cf. S. Thom. ii. ii. q. i. a. 9. Schwane, iii. 541

71 Hase, p. 20, note 54.

One would naturally have supposed that our attempts to set the positive teaching of the Church on a philosophical basis, would not have encountered serious opposition from Protestants, for they claim a "reasonable service of God" as peculiarly their own. Nay, they stake the very existence of their Church on it. The maintenance of the Evangelical Church as such, says a learned Protestant divine,[72] will depend entirely on the question whether the problem proposed by Ritschl is soluble and is really being solved. "Churches that have stripped "religion of priests and mysteries are, by their very origin, "forced to build their foundation on a reasonable worship "[λογικὴ λατρεία], and to give their members a real under-"standing of the Christian religion. The moment they would "renounce this aim, even should they be able to hold their "ground for centuries alongside the Catholic Churches, their "continuance would then rest on the same foundations that "secure to Catholic Churches a long duration, viz. on authority, custom, and vague sentiments." *

30. In Hase's opinion the infallibility of the Church is simply one of her "grand and brilliant dreams." She was compelled, by the peculiar circumstances of the times, to claim it. "Exalted above all human error she would be able to "bear the weight of the mighty, though tottering, Roman "empire, and to accustom to discipline and piety the rude "races that, in the vigour of youth, had suddenly become "possessed of the vast riches of a corrupt civilization. She "would be able, too, in the midst of a semi-christian and "semi-heathen civilization, to save such unity of Christendom "as existed, from being split asunder into sects."[73] And how

72 Harnack, *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1887, nr. 2.

73 Hase, p. 41.

* After this the author goes on to quote a whole page of admissions from Protestant writers of the School of Ritschl which the translators have omitted, as they deem it sheer jargon, of a sort at once unintelligible and untranslateable. Their drift seems to be this, that a Church as such, with a positive creed,—were it only the one article of the infallibility of the Bible,—stands condemned at the bar of history, as well as of philosophy, if it be not infallible. No Church or community can exist and hang together on the mere sentiment of vague trust in Christ. Tr.

would this gigantic task have been accomplished by a "brilliant "dream?" Persecutions were weighing her down; the nations were unsettled and in a state of upheaval; heresies were beating at her gates. How could the Church have held her ground against these foes as an unassailable authority, had she not been imperishable and infallible? To say that this "dream" was necessary, is to concede that the history of the Church without infallibility is an enigma. Is it less necessary in our own day? The same author thus continues his lamentation: "When will the day dawn, when whole nations shall again "combine religious earnestness with spiritual manhood to such "a degree, that they will neither need nor tolerate an infallible "Church which, if it exists, must needs enslave the mind?" Does not the alternative at present lie between an infallible Church and unbelief? It is now more evident than ever that Christianity is being gradually rejected wherever the authority of the visible Church is being denied. On the other hand, the authority of the Church supports whatever in the Christian religion rests on authority, i.e. the Christian religion itself, "so that Christ "is an authority with us only in so far as the Church is an "authority."[74] An authority that holds sovereign sway on the most important occasions of man's life, an authority to which the absolute revelation of the God-Man has been entrusted, and in which the God-Man continues to dwell, is nothing if not infallible, unless, indeed, everything is to be swallowed up in uncertainty and doubt, unbelief and superstition. Thus internal and external grounds, reason, history, Scripture and Tradition, unite their forces to establish the Church's infallibility.

In conclusion, we will once again let a Protestant theologian speak for himself. Professor Sohm had said that "the "(Lutheran) Confession is the great ruling power in the "Church, and that it ought to be again enthroned." Whereupon Harnack observes: "I cannot but think it very remarkable "that our age, in spite of the noble strides it has made towards

74 Möhler, p. 340-342.

"progress, should at last throw itself into the arms of the old "confession. For one is easily persuaded that one believes "such articles, when the need arises. But it could hardly "be the Lutheran confession. Take for instance the proposition: "'The confession is in truth the great ruling power in the "'Church.' Speaking as a Christian, theologian, and historian, "I say that this reminds me of no institution but the Roman "Church. For outside the Gospel, in all that goes by the name "of Church, there is but one great power, and that is the Pope "of Rome." "As Evangelical Christians we are battling with "a formidably entrenched foe, the spirit of the world and the "time-spirit. Yet we are divided in our own camp, and "weakened by an internal crisis that no amount of good-will "can set at rest. The romantic, philosophical means by which "two generations explained away the opposition between their "belief and that of the old confessions, are spent. In this "age of Realism, history has blown them to the four winds. "There remains naught but authority to maintain the old faith in "its entirety. But ruled by authority, Evangelical Christianity "will, sooner or later, have to take to flight. The fifteenth "century is again repeating itself: A forward movement "has been carrying Christian and Ecclesiastical principles "[authority] upwards since the beginning of this century till "our own day."[75] Beyschlag detects this special danger in the situation: that the Catholic Church "demands blind (!) "submission to authority, and imposes superstition (!) not "only on its own adherents but also on Protestants."[76] If this last be true, as we would feign hope, all who love the Christian religion will be truly thankful Those among Protestants who are impressed by the authority of the Catholic Church, have undoubtedly good reason for fixing their gaze on the Church of their fathers, especially when they see that the only counter-

75 Sohm, *Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss*. Leipzig 1888. p. 175. Harnack, *l.c.* Nr. 3. Col. 54.

76 Beyschlag, *Die Religion und die moderne Gesellschaft*. Halle 1887. See *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1888, Nr. 6. Col. 143.

poise to their internal disunion which the Protestant party can suggest is the civil power.[77] But the human mind has at last found the inconsistencies and moral bankruptcy of Protestantism unbearable. Consequently there runs through every thoughtful and religious Protestant mind a deep vein of pessimism and gloomy foreboding. It is the latest testimony to the fact that without an infallible authority religion has no sure footing.

IV. NATURE AND EXTENT OF INFALLIBILITY.

31. In what the essence of the Church's infallibility lies, and how far it extends, may easily be gathered from the foregoing. The end and office of the Church is man's eternal salvation. Only such matters, then, as immediately bear on this end can be the object of an infallible decision of faith. And since, moreover, the Church must gather from God's word in Scripture or Tradition what does regard faith and morals, it is clear that new revelations or inspiration are out of the question.

In contradistinction to the positive action of the Holy Spirit in inspiration, it is usual to call the act by which He preserves the Church from error in decisions of faith and morals, by the name of "*assistentia*." Though the Councils of Trent and the Vatican refer the limitation as to faith and morals directly to the interpretation of Holy Scripture, still *a fortiori* it holds good in all positive final decisions. Infallibility, however, extends only to the formal decisions or definitions. The overwhelming majority of theologians hold that the motives and proofs of the definitions are not immediately of faith.[78] Not, indeed, that it is to the faithful a matter of indifference how the Church proves her definitions. For, as the consent of the Fathers is of great importance in matters of faith, so the consent of bishops assembled in Council from all countries is of still greater moment.

77 Kawerau, *Über Berechtigung und Bedeutung des landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments*, Keil 1887, Col. 144.

78 Melchior Canus, I. Thes. v. 5. Stapleton, *Principia fidei* vi. 10. 11. Scheeben I. 237. Heinrich I. 768. *Kirchenlexicon*, 2 ed. III. 804.

For these are precisely the means which the organs of the Church have to employ, in order to attain, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, to the knowledge of revealed truth that has been committed to the Church. The Church's infallibility is a gift of the Holy Ghost. Like every other gift, it must be set in motion by man's action, reason and will, subject to God's directions, although the result be independent of these; for it is a question not of personal salvation but of the welfare of the Church at large. This comparison with grace comes all the nearer home, as, according to the proposition repeatedly laid down by S. Augustine in his doctrine of grace, God prepares the good will. As Christ promised and sent the Holy Spirit to the Apostles and their successors, so, when discharging collectively the infallible office of teaching, the necessary wisdom and power can never fail them.

32.† The question as to the *nature* and *extent* of infallibility properly belongs to dogmatic, not to apologetic theology. But as it is so important to have a clear view of the Catholic doctrine we give the main points. It will be best answered by resolving it into separate questions. (1) What kind of a divine assistance does it imply [genus infallibilitatis]? (2) Who are they that are so assisted [subjectum infallibilitatis]? (3) When are they so assisted, that is in what acts objectively considered, or in what province of truth [objectum infallibilitatis]? (4) In what acts subjectively considered [forma infallibilitatis]? The main principles for answering these questions are all contained in the preceding chapters.

(1) In the first place, the infallibility claimed by the Church, as the divinely appointed teacher of revealed truth, is what is technically and specifically called *assistance*. It does not consist in an act of revelation on the part of God; nor is it inspiration, properly so called; nor suggestion of thought by word or vision, as in the case of the Prophets and Apostles. For revelation, as was shown in chapter I., was closed with the Apostles. But the very term assistance implies that the

Church is doing a work in itself human—the work of a human witness. It is her duty to study, to inquire, and investigate from all the sources at her command, from Holy Scripture, and tradition, and her own living faith and practice in the past and in the present. Some truths revealed by the Apostles she has always explicitly confessed; others which were but implicitly contained in revelation have to be developed and brought to light, as the need arises; it is in the latter case that the human element comes chiefly into play. Here she requires a special help from God, to prevent her from arriving at a final and definite conclusion at variance with revelation. And be it noted, it is the conclusion, not the arguments or their logical force, that is infallible; it is not the preliminary steps but the final testimony that is divine, owing to the assistance of the Divine Spirit who would warn the Church from a conclusion, were it not contained in the Apostolic deposit. Great, indeed, and unique is the force and authority of her human testimony, but of itself it would not be *that* absolute and infallible testimony which, from the very nature of things, is requisite in an act of divine faith on the part of the believer. Or, in other words: The Church is assisted by the Holy Ghost, whenever she *explicitly* proposes a truth to be believed as revealed. But such explicit proposition was necessarily limited in the beginning and must grow with time; consequently there will be infallible definitions, and in this sense, new articles of faith, as time goes on. In this explicit proposition of revealed truth the Church is not a purely human witness to a fact of the past, but an official and divinely appointed witness, assisted by the Holy Ghost. Still this presupposes her human testimony; she has to verify the fact in an intelligent human way. Doctrines, therefore, so proposed by the Church are indeed the word of God; not because they are so proposed, but because they have been formerly revealed by God. The infallible proposition only tends to give us absolute certainty that it is the real genuine word of God.

(2) To whom, then, is this divine assistance promised and given? The answer is no longer doubtful. It belongs to the divinely appointed official witnesses. It appertains in reality to the Apostolic office, and consequently to those with whom the Apostolic office and power rests. Now, as we have seen above, individual bishops have not full Apostolic power; their jurisdiction is limited to their diocese; and, again, that jurisdiction, including the power to teach and testify, is received from an Apostle, and may be taken away by him, and against his will there is no appeal. A bishop, in order to make even his limited jurisdiction truly Apostolic, requires *missio apostolica*. This holds good for all times. Without such connection with an Apostle, no bishop can be reputed in the Apostolic succession, and his testimony is of no value whatever. This being so, it clearly follows first, that the testimony of individual bishops in union with him who alone is an Apostle (real successor) is not infallible, because it is not the testimony of the full Apostolic power; secondly that the testimony of all the bishops in union with the Apostolic see is and must be infallible; thirdly that the testimony of him who is a true successor of an Apostle is by itself infallible. The first two propositions have always been *explicitly* taught by the Church, the latter only since the Vatican Council Thus the *subjectum infallibilitatis* is both the Pope as successor of S. Peter by himself, and the Pope and bishops considered as one body, because the subject in the last analysis is the Apostolic office and power.

(3) In which matters are they assisted by the Holy Ghost? This question also now finds an easy and natural solution. The Apostolic office is directly instituted to teach the revealed truth and impart divine grace, to sanctify men by divine truth, grace and virtue. These are its two chief and main functions. There are other acts, disciplinary and directive, but these are subsidiary. And of the two main functions, the office of teaching is the more fundamental. Truth and faith are

paramount. In matters of revealed truth, then, the Church is and must be infallible. The divinely appointed witnesses must be assisted by God, when in the name of the Apostolic office they propose to men what has been revealed. Infallibility must belong to the main and primary functions of the Apostolate. Upon this point all Catholics are agreed, and this has ever been the Church's teaching. The Church is *certainly* infallible in her full and final declarations of revealed truth. It is equally certain that her infallibility does not extend to matters that have nothing whatever to do with revealed truth. So far infallibility is limited by the scope of the Apostolic office. But as it is a function of the Apostolate not only to teach and declare revealed truth against direct denial, but also to safeguard it against even indirect attacks, no matter from what quarter they may come, and as natural truth is often closely interlaced with supernatural, those who hold the Apostolic office, may often be obliged to pass doctrinal and final decisions upon matters closely connected with the deposit; so closely connected that the deposit could not stand without them. Hence it is still a controverted point among theologians whether divine assistance is to be claimed for such doctrinal decisions, or whether the human ecclesiastical authority of the Church is a sufficient guarantee of their truth or falsehood, as the case may be. Meanwhile no Catholic denies that obedience is due to all such decisions of the Church. But then obedience, even internal, is not quite the same as absolute and irreformable assent.

(4) Which acts of the teaching Church can claim divine assistance? This question, too, is easily answered from what precedes. The divine assistance *certainly* belongs to those acts in which the Church uses her Apostolic authority to teach and testify finally, definitely and explicitly what is to be believed as revealed truth. Whence it follows that she need not be infallible in any preliminary steps, or in any acts of her teaching office that are not meant to be final and definite. Much less is

she infallible in simple acts of government, policy or discipline. Such are the broad principles on the nature and extent of the Church's infallibility, as far as they come within the scope of Apology. We must beware both of unduly extending and of unduly limiting it.[79]

79 See on this subject the pamphlet entitled: *A Letter to W. J. Ward on the Theory of Infallible Instruction*, by H. I. D. Ryder. London: Longmans & Co., 1868.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CHURCH NECESSARY FOR SALVATION.

1. In the Old Testament the Theocracy, established by God Himself, was the union of those whom God had chosen from out the mass of idolaters—the *elect*. Jahve concluded a covenant with His people to assure them of His special favour and gracious protection. "If therefore," said He, "you shall hear "my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my peculiar "possession above all people; for all the earth is mine." (Exod. XIX. 5.) "The mercy of the Lord is from eternity and unto "eternity, upon them that fear Him: and His justice unto "children's children to such as keep His covenant, and are "mindful of His commandments to do them." (Ps. CII. 17. 18.) God promises to keep His covenant with the Jews, and to be ever mindful of them. Even when they were in the land of their enemies He did not cast them off altogether, nor make void His covenant with them.[1] But them that break their covenant with God He will chastise. "When there shall be "found among you, within any of thy gates . . . man or "woman that do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, and "transgress His covenant . . . thou shalt bring forth the "man or woman who have committed that most wicked thing, "to the gates of thy city, and they shall be stoned."[2] "When

1 Lev. xxvi. 42. Deut. iv. 31; vii. 9.
2 Deut. xvii. 2-5; xxix. 21. Jos. vii. 25.

"you shall have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your "God, which He hath made with you, and shall have served "strange gods and adored them: then shall the indignation of "the Lord rise up quickly and speedily against you, and you "shall be taken away from this excellent land which He hath "delivered to you."[3]

The promised land was the reward that God promised and gave to His people for keeping the covenant. According as the people observed or broke the covenant, God's protection alternated with His wrath. So long as the Israelites remained loyal and true to their God, they were secure against all their foes around. But when they proved faithless to Jahve, they fell helplessly a prey to their foes, who worshipped idols and seduced them into idolatry,—foes who had no part in the God of Israel. For every Israelite was firmly persuaded that none but those who bore the mark of the covenant were true sons of Abraham, and had a share in the divine blessings. In this sense the Old Covenant decidedly claimed the distinction of being the only religion that scattered blessings in this life, so generally was temporal well-being regarded as the fruit of the fear of the Lord. He who will come to God must belong to the chosen people; anyhow he must be in communion with God's people and sanctuary. This people alone is God's peculiar possession, His favourite Son who has received from His Father's table the fulness of grace and blessing.

2. The Old Testament, however, in addition to its particularism, which excluded all idolaters from God's inheritance, and condemned all fellowship with the heathen, had likewise a universal tendency in another direction, namely in regard to life eternal. The nations will not be precluded from salvation for ever. A time will come when they shall invoke Jahve's true name and be saved. Only those, however, who call upon Him from Sion shall see salvation. "In Mount Sion shall be

3 Jos. xxiii. 16. Judges ii. 20. III Kings xi. 11. Is. xxiv. 8. Jer. xi. 3; xxii. 8, 9; xxxiv. 18. Ezech. xvii. 19. Os. viii. 1.

"salvation, and it shall be holy; and the house of Jacob shall "possess those that possessed them. And the house of Jacob "shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house "of Esau stubble; and they shall be kindled in them, and shall "devour them; and there shall be no remains of the house of "Esau, for the Lord hath spoken it." (Abdias 17. 18). The new Jerusalem shall open its gates to receive the strength of the Gentiles. "For the nation and the kingdom that will not "serve thee, shall perish; and the Gentiles shall be wasted with "desolation." (Isaias LX. 11. 12). "And all they that shall "be left of all nations that come against Jerusalem, shall go up "from year to year, to adore the King, and Lord of hosts, and "to keep the feast of tabernacles." (Zach. XIV. 16). A prospect of salvation is ever held out to the heathen, but it is made dependent on membership with Holy Sion, on union with the sanctuary that God had set up in the midst of His people. And there is but one Mount Sion, one Jerusalem, and one sanctuary, with one Shepherd, Lord and King. Outside this one Messianic kingdom, to which all the Gentiles have access, there is no salvation for men. The way to the salvation of the Messianic kingdom lies through the sanctuary of the chosen people. In the time of the Messias, the nations draw near to the house of the God of Jacob, and are reckoned just with God's people if they keep the Sabbath and the covenant. They are admitted to the temple and sacrifices, and are enrolled as citizens in Jerusalem. This explains why the Jews who, at first, were bitterly exclusive, subsequently made proselytes.[4]

3. Eventually the Messianic kingdom grew up as the New Sion and the New Jerusalem, in a manner quite different from that which the mere letter of the prophets signified, and in a way contrary to Jewish expectations and Jewish hopes. Nevertheless the prophetic promises were fulfilled in their spirit and meaning. Only they that have a part in the New Israel

4 Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.* 2 ed. London 1884; II. 411. Selbst, p. 87.

are enrolled as citizens in the New Jerusalem, belong to God's people, and attain the Messianic salvation, eternal life. But with the carnal Jews it was a fixed principle that the Old Israel, the descendants of Israel according to the flesh, each and all, but none other would be saved.[5]

4. The teaching of the New Testament is clear and precise on this point. Theoretically speaking there is no doubt among Christians that salvation is to be found in Christ and in the Christian Church alone. The declarations made by our Lord and the Apostles are so formal and definite that we need only mention a few. The narrow gate and the narrow road, mentioned at the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, in conjunction with the warning against false prophets, point to Him who alone can give eternal life, whom we must confess before men, if we are to be confessed before the Father,—to Jesus, the Messias and Son of God, the Lawgiver of the Messianic kingdom. Imitation of Christ which, like belief in Him, is set down as a condition for obtaining eternal life, shows, too, that only those, who are united with Christ in His passion and death, will rise with Him to a new life. The same thought is also brought out in the parables spoken concerning the kingdom of heaven: the great supper, the vineyard, and others. None but those who hear the voice of the Redeemer sent by God, shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Not descent from Abraham according to the flesh, nor high birth, nor honourable position, but poverty in spirit, meekness and humility, after the example of Christ, lead to eternal life. "He that believeth and is baptized shall "be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark XVI. 16), said the risen Saviour to His disciples, when He commissioned them to preach the Gospel.

5. This twofold condition for obtaining eternal life is put forward repeatedly and with especial prominence in S. John's

5 See Luke xiii. 23. Matthew iii. 9; and Schanz, *Comment. in Luc.* p. 373. *Comment. in Matth.* p. 127.

Gospel. Belief in Jesus, Baptism, and the Eucharist are the fundamental conditions of eternal life. Belief in the word of Jesus, in Jesus Himself as the Saviour of man, as the Son of God, figures so conspicuously as the central point of all Christ's teaching, that it marks a distinct advance on the Synoptists in this respect. "He that believeth in Him (the Son) is "not judged; but he that doth not believe is already judged; "because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten "Son of God." (John III. 18). "He that believeth in the "Son hath life everlasting; but he that believeth not the "Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in "him." (III. 36). "This is the will of my Father who sent "me: that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth in "Him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at "the last day."[6] "Jesus is the door of the fold. If any "one enter by Him, he shall be saved." (X. 7. 9). "He is "the way, the truth and the life. No man cometh to the "Father but by Him." (XIV. 6. 7). "He is the vine, in whom "they must abide to bear fruit." (XIV. 5. 6). "He is the light "which enlighteneth every man." "This is life everlasting: "that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ "whom thou hast sent." (XVII. 3).

6. What, too, do the Apostles declare as to the Gospel being the only power to save? It would be an endless task to quote all the passages either in the Epistles, the Acts, or the Apocalypse. But as connected with the foregoing we may make a beginning with the conclusion of S. John's Gospel: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the "Christ, the Son of God: and that believing you may have "life in His name." (XX. 31.) According to the same Apostle there are but two armies. In the one the forces marshalled are truth, the love of God, and the observance of God's commandments; and these are ranged on the side of Christ and the Father. On the opposing side—that of Satan—the army

6 John vi. 40. See also v. 24; vi. 47; viii. 51; x. 27, 28; xii. 26.

is recruited from falsehood, hatred and darkness. The two are in irreconcilable antagonism, and man must choose between them once for all.[7] "There shall not enter it anything defiled, "or any one that worketh abomination, or a lie, but they who "are written in the book of life of the Lamb." (Apoc. XXI. 27.) The same thought is ever recurring in S. Peter's discourses. He puts the whole question in a nutshell when he says: "This "is the stone which was rejected by you—the builders; which "is become the head of the corner. Nor is there salvation in "any other. For there is no other name, under heaven, given "to men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts IV. 11, 12.) And, in like manner, Paul made answer to the keeper of the prison: "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved and thy "house." (Acts XVI. 31.)

7. S. Paul has treated speculatively the whole question of salvation in Christ from a broad historical standpoint. And in this he is unique. He passes in view the history and life of the Gentiles; he searches the Scriptures, and discovers that the belief and practice of the Jews were at variance with divine revelation; he contrasts the universal sinfulness reigning amongst Jews and Gentiles with the truth and grace bestowed in creation, with the law written on the heart, as well as with the positive supernatural law; and he finds that all have swerved from truth and rectitude. "There is none that doth "good; there is not so much as one." (Rom. III. 12.) "Whosoever have sinned without the law, shall perish without "the law; and whosoever have sinned in the law, shall be "judged by the law." (Rom. II. 12.) There is no salvation except in Christ. "For all have sinned, and do need the "glory of God. Being justified gratis by his grace, through the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. III. 23 24). The grace of God, by Jesus Christ, can alone deliver man from sin and misery. "If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord "Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up

7 I. John ii. 3-6; ii. 17; iii. 6-9; v. 3.

"from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart, we "believe unto justice; but, with the mouth, confession is made "unto salvation." (Rom. x. 9, 10). "Having therefore, "brethren, a confidence in entering into the sanctuary by the "blood of Christ, a new and living way, which he hath dedicated "for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh."[8] "For there "is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man "Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a redemption for all, a testi-"mony in due times." (I Tim. II. 5. 6). So great a dread had theApostles and disciples of the dangers of apostacy, that they would never exchange a word in conversation with any one who had fallen away from the truth. "A man that is an "heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid; knowing "that he that is such an one, is subverted and sinneth, being "condemned by his own judgment." (Titus III. 10. 11.)[9]

8. In his first Epistle S. Peter discourses on Christian hope in order to comfort and encourage the faithful who were in danger, or actually suffering persecution. For having been redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ, and being born again, not of corruptible seed, but by the living word of God, Christians may hope with confidence in the grace that is in the revelation and second coming of Christ And their hope shall not be blighted. For "the God and Father of our "Lord Jesus Christ, who according to His great mercy hath "regenerated us unto a lively hope, through the resurrection of "Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible "and undefiled, and that fadeth not, reserved in heaven for "you who by the power of God are kept by faith unto salvation, "ready to be revealed in the last time." (I Peter I. 3. 5). As in time past eight souls were saved in Noe's Ark by water, so baptism being alike in form now saveth and sanctifieth Christians. (I Peter III. 20, 21.)

8 Hebr. x. 19: See also vii. 25. ix. 15; xii. 24. Also Vatican Council, *constit. de fide cath.* c. iii. can. 1. Scheeben, 1. 43.

9 See Iren., *Adv. Haer.* iii. 3, 4.

9. The Apostle S. James knows of nothing but the engrafted word of God "which is able to save your souls" (James I. 21). "He that hath looked into the perfect law of liberty, and hath "continued therein, not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer "of the work; this man shall be blessed in his deed." (I. 25).

10. The antagonism also between the disciples, whom Christ has saved from the world, and the world and its ruler, so forcibly brought out in the Gospels and Epistles, proves the same thing. The faithful, like the Jews in the Old Testament, have been separated from the heathen multitude and the sinful world, and snatched from temporal and eternal destruction, in order to obtain eternal life through Christ and in union with Him. The world hates the disciples of Jesus, because they are not of the world, because Christ has chosen them out of the world to make them His own. The Jews will put the disciples out of the synagogues; yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth them, will think that he doth a service to God. (John XV. 19; XVI. 2). And all these things they will do because they have not known the Father who sent Jesus. If Jesus had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. (John XV. 22). The little flock, following the shepherd, is the new synagogue in which alone is salvation. It is hated and persecuted by the world, because this world's ruler hates the mightier One who has come to dispoil him of his armour; but Christ has promised that it shall last until He come again. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world. It came from heaven, and to heaven it leads.

14. S. Paul usually addresses his letters to the "saints," to those "sanctified" in Christ Jesus, thereby signifying that Christians have been set apart from the multitude, and dedicated to God. As God, in the Old Testament, was preeminently called Holy, because He was the one only God in opposition to idols, so everything not profane, that stood in any relation to God, was also holy. First and foremost Israel should be

holy;[10] holy, also, should be the priests who ministered to God; and holy, too, the vestments, vessels, places and cities destined for God's service. This antithesis between things sacred and profane is founded on moral holiness. The saints of God must be free from sin, and be remarkable for piety and justice. Then will the "saints of the Most High" take possession of the kingdom of God. "Thou art a holy people to the Lord "thy God. The Lord thy God hath chosen thee, to be His "peculiar people, of all peoples that are upon the earth."[11]

Both significations are applicable to the "saints" mentioned by the Apostle. By grace they were called from heathen darkness into Christian light, chosen from the impure heathen and stiff-necked Jews, and destined for life eternal. Christians, before receiving the name Christian, were called saints, as having been chosen and sanctified by Christ. (I Cor. I. 4; Philemon I. 3). Consequently "sanctification" was closely bound up with justification: "For whom He foreknew, He also "predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His "Son . . . . and whom He predestinated, them also He "called; and whom He called, them also He justified; and "whom He justified, them also He glorified." (Rom. VIII. 29. 30). . . "The faithful are now washed, they are sanctified "and justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in "the Spirit of our God." (I Cor. VI. 11).

12. The comparison which the Apostle draws between baptism and the death and resurrection of Christ, is most significant. The symbolism is as clear as it is beautiful. By immersion in the water the Christian dies and is buried; when he rises from the water he comes forth from the tomb and lives again. As water cleanses the body, so the blood of Christ cleanses the soul from the stain of sin; and thus we become new creatures, with our lost beauty restored; we awake to a new life, through the grace of the Risen Saviour. "Know you

10 Exod. xix. 6. Lev. xx. 26. Is. lxii. 12.

11 Deut. vii. 6; xiv. ; xxvi. 18. 19. See also Exod. xxii. 31. Lev. i. 44; xxix. 2; xxi. 6. 8.

"not all that we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized "in His death? For we are buried together with Him by "baptism unto death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by "the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of "life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of "His death, in like manner we shall be of His resurrection." (Rom. VI. 3-5). "But when the goodness and kindness of our "Saviour, God, appeared; not by the works of justice, which "we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by "the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost, "whom He hath poured forth upon us abundantly, through "Jesus Christ our Saviour." (Titus III. 4-6).[12]

13. Christ, then, and His religion, according to the clear and explicit doctrine of Scripture, are the only means of salvation. But the form in which Christ and Christianity have come down to us in history, is the Church. Therefore the Church is the only means of salvation. If salvation is to be found nowhere but in Christianity, because it contains the absolute divine revelation which renders reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ possible, and dispenses sanctification by separating the elect from the mass, by sanctifying in baptism, and by giving grace to lead a holy life,—all this must be found in the institution that Christ destined to carry on His work in the world. For not the least part of the teaching of Jesus is taken up with setting forth the task that He imposed on His Church to dispense salvation to men to the end of time.[13] Thus the Church must be the only institution in which salvation is to be found, because, by the ordinance of the All-Holy God, she has the stewardship of truth and the means of grace, and because the end which she strives to promote and for which she works under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is the sanctification and salvation of the faithful.

14. The inference we have drawn is supported by the direct

12 I Cor. XV. 50. Gal. V. 16. 17. 19. Col. I. 21. 22. Ephes. IV. 22.
13 See Kuhn, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1855, p. 7.

testimony of the Apostles. Thus S. Paul, in the oft-quoted passage, says: "Christ also loved the Church and delivered "Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by "the laver of water in the word of life, that He might present "it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, "nor any such thing, but that it should be holy and without "blemish." (Ephes. v. 25-27). S. Peter likewise tells us that all inward working of grace and sanctification comes to the faithful in and with the Church, that is, in so far as they are formed into one body organically connected. "Unto whom "coming as to a living stone, rejected indeed by men, but "chosen and made honourable by God: Be ye also as living "stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer "up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. . . . "But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy "nation, a purchased people, that you may declare His virtue "who hath called you out of darkness into His admirable light. "Who in time past were not a people, but are now the people "of God: who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained "mercy." (I Peter II. 4-10).

15. The post-Apostolic age knew of no truth or grace or Christianity outside the Church. This being so, it was a self-evident truth with the men of that age that nowhere but in the Church was salvation to be found. Only in the unity, charity and fellowship of the Church is this sanctification and salvation to be obtained. They who sever themselves from her, have no part with her, and contract an alliance with the synagogue of Anti-christ. They who are cast forth from her, are handed over to Satan; they can no more be members of the body of Christ, or branches of the vine. *S. Ignatius*, following the precedent set by the Apostles, addresses his Epistles to the "holy Church." To receive aright the Sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist, he expressly insists on the necessity of being in communion with the Church and the bishop. "He who is not "within the altar, loses the divine bread." "He who joins

"himself to a sectary, shall have no inheritance in the kingdom "of God." "Each one who is in union with God and Christ, "is also in union with the bishop." Heresy is a foreign plant, a deadly poison flavoured with wine. Heretics are beasts in human form, wolves, godless and unbelieving. *S. Polycarp* calls them the "firstborn of Satan." *Clement of Rome* warns the Corinthians against schism, and declares that submission is the only road to salvation. "For it is better to be found "in the flock of Christ with humility and good repute, than to "possess great influence and authority and to perish in "despair."[14]

Justin and *Clement of Alexandria*, as we have seen, openly acknowledged that before the Christian era the Logos had influenced and prepared the heathen, and had thus in a measure provided them with a substitute for the truth of Christianity;[15] nevertheless in opposition to the many heresies then stalking abroad, they boldly proclaim the Church as the exclusive harbour of salvation. Justin brands heretics as unrighteous and lawless men, whose fellowship Christians should shun. "To obtain salvation we must fly to God's holy "churches. Heretical doctrines lead those who trust in them "to destruction," remarks Theophilus. To the Gnostics, whether they appealed to special Scriptures or to a secret tradition, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* opposed the shield of the Catholic Church. They disputed the right of heretics to exist because truth and salvation are to be found only in the Church, and in her alone the Holy Spirit dwells. The Church judges all, and is herself judged of none. She judges even schismatics who have no love for God, who set their own interests above the unity of the Church, and for slight causes lacerate and, as far as in them lies, slay the glorious body of Christ. The most praiseworthy act they can to do is to destroy schism. But the Church likewise judges those who are outside the pale of truth,

14 Ignat., *Ad Ephes.* c. 4. 5. *Philad.* c. 3. *Trall.* c. 6. Clem., Rom. I Cor. 57. 2.
15 See *Christ. Apol.* vol. II. chap. vii.

i.e. the Church. True knowledge lies in the doctrines taught by the Apostles and in the ancient status of the Church throughout the world "For the gift of God (faith) is entrusted "to the Church in order that she may give life to the creature, "that she may quicken all her members, in whom there is "communion with Christ, because in her is deposited the "Holy Ghost, the pledge of immortality, the strength of faith, "the ladder for ascending unto God."[16]

Miracles, again, are unknown among heretics, whereas they are of constant occurrence in the Church; miracles on the sick and those possessed by devils; miracles also of the spirit are seen in the conversion of peoples. Where the gifts of God are stored up, there also must truth be.[17]

16. It must not, however, be supposed that the sects were the cause of the doctrine itself: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* They were merely the occasion for bringing it into greater prominence than it might otherwise have obtained. They made Catholics set greater store by the priceless gift of ecclesiastical unity and truth. "This doctrine," says a Protestant writer, "was developed in the hard struggle with a "tornado of sects," some threatening to dissolve Christianity into "a peaceful philosophy, others claiming to set up a nobler "and more spiritual Christianity and a spotless Church by "pushing contempt of the world to extremes."[18] This may be granted, provided we mean by development the unfolding of a principle already existent in the Catholic Church. If Christ and the Apostles preached and bequeathed to the Church the truth and grace that can alone save, heretical onslaughts must have strengthened the conviction that outside the Church there is no salvation. And the sects, by claiming this privilege for their own body as against the Church, thereby acknowledged that there can be but one Church in which salvation can be

16 Just. *Dial.* c. 35. Theoph. *Ad. Autol.* ii, 14. Iren. iv. 33, 7, 8.
17 Iren. iv. 3. 4; iii. 26, 5.
18 Hase, p. 42.

found. The vast majority of the faithful were in no doubt that the Catholic Church was the one Church. "The Catholic "Church," says Lactantius, "has the true worship. She is the "source of life, the home of faith, the temple of God. He "that enters not into her, or departs from her, is so far from "the hope of eternal life and salvation. And yet the several "bodies of heretics consider themselves Christians, and their "Church Catholic."[19]

17. The Fathers eagerly appropriated S. Peter's simile of the ark, and explained the ark as a type of the Church. Only those are saved who take shelter in the Church against the waves and surging floods of the world. *S. Cyprian*, in particular, has developed this thought.[20] More than any ancient Father he has drawn out in all its consequences the doctrine that salvation is to be found in Church alone. Nay he went so far that, in opposition to the great majority of the Church's doctors and to Pope Stephen, he declared that baptism administered outside the Church was invalid, because the Church alone can dispense grace, and alone possesses the Holy Spirit.[21] He made *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* the Church's watchword, and it has remained so ever since, although the view defended by the Pope ultimately prevailed. He who separates from the Church, Christ's true bride, and joins himself to an adulteress, is cut adrift from the Church's promises. He has no part in Christ's rewards who deserts Christ's Church. He is a stranger, a profane person, an enemy. "Any one outside the Church will escape, if any out-"side Noe's ark could escape." "He who clings not to this "unity clings neither to the law of God, nor to faith in Father "and Son, nor to life and salvation." "He who has torn "himself asunder from the Church must be avoided and

19 *Instit.* iv. 30.

20 *De Unit.* 6. *Epist.* 69. 2; 74, 11. Firmil., Inter Epp. Cypr. 75, 15. cf. Tertull. *De Bapt.* c. 8. Hieron, *Adv. Lucif.* n. 22. *Ep. ad Dam.* 14. See Kraus, *Real-Encyclop.* ii. 300.

21 *Epist.* 74, 4; 76, 3. See also *Ep.* 75.

"shunned. Such a one is subverted, and sinneth, being "condemned by his own judgment (Titus III. 11). Does he "think that he can be with Christ, when he lays his hands on "Christ's priests, and separates from his clergy and people? "He bears arms against the Church, and fights against God's "ordinance. He is an enemy of the altar, a rebel against the "sacrifice of Christ, a renegade to the faith, guilty of perjury "to religion, a disobedient slave. And does he dare, despised "by the bishops and abandoned by the priests of God, to set "up another altar, to pray with unhallowed words, and to "profane the true sacrifice of the Lord with false sacrifices"?[22] "He who has not the Church for his mother, neither has he "God for his father."

18. Nor does S. Cyprian hesitate to deny that heretics can merit the palm of martyrdom. "Heretics, even if they were "slain in confessing the name of Christ, would not wash out "the stain of heresy with their blood. No one can be a "martyr, who is not in the Church." And *S. Augustine* supports his view: "Being outside the Church, separated from "the frame of unity and the bonds of love, you will be punished "with everlasting tortures, even if you willingly gave yourself "up to be burnt alive for the name of Christ."[23] And he appeals to the Apostle who sets charity above martyrdom (I Cor. XIII. 13). Christian unity and the charity of the Holy Spirit can be found only in the Catholic Church. None but they who have Christ for their head attain eternal life and salvation. And no one can have Christ for his head, who is not in His body, which is the Church. This Church is the Catholic Church, which was then the Roman State Church. Outside this Church, in which alone is salvation, even martyrdom cannot lead to Christ.[24]

19. Though *S. Augustine* combated S. Cyprian's opinion, and maintained that baptism administered by heretics was valid

22 *De Unit.* c. 6 et 17.
23 *Ep.* 173, 6. *De Bapt.* 3, 16; 4, 24. *Sermo ad Caes. Eccles.* n. 6.
24 Aug. *De Unit.* c. 19. See also Orig., *Homil IV. in Jos.* Hieron., *Epist.* 14.

because it, too, is Christ's baptism, still he is very far from putting it, in practice and in effect, on an equal footing with the Church's baptism. Rather he is of the same opinion as S. Irenæus, that the Holy Ghost is communicated only in that Church in which He dwells; only where charity is, are sins forgiven.[25] There is no charity in schism, or schismatics would not be blinded by brotherly hatred. Baptism, he says, is indeed valid, but sin is not forgiven until man has become reconciled to unity, and is free from the sacrilege of schism. Or, if sin is forgiven in the moment of baptism, it returns with schism. For nowhere but in the Catholic Church is the Holy Spirit received through the imposition of hands. He is charity, which they are not who are cut off from communion with the Church, and love not its unity. The Apostles received the Holy Ghost unto the remission of sins. (John xx. 22, 23). Now, since this was said to them, as representing the Church, it is the peace of the Church that remits sins, and estrangement from the Church that retains them. Hence all heretics and schismatics are pseudo-christians, because they possess only the outward sign of Christianity, without its unity and charity.[26] Those not in communion with the Catholic Church will not gain life eternal. "If by thine impatience thou shouldst break through the bosom of the Church, she will send thee forth in pain, but to thy misfortune rather than her own."[27] "Truth dwells in the body of the Church. Anyone separated from this necessarily speaks falsehood. "Only the Church Catholic is "the body of Christ, Who is its head. Outside this body the "Holy Spirit quickens none, because as the Apostle says "(Rom. v. 8) the charity of God is poured forth into our hearts "by the Holy Spirit that is given us. If any one, therefore, "desires to possess the Holy Spirit, let him beware of being

25 *De Baptismo*, passim. Cf. Hier., *Adv. Lucif.* n. 9. Leo M., *Ep.* 152, 7; 166, 2. 167, 18.

26 *De Bapt.* 3, 18, 19. *De fide et Symb.* c. 10. Hieron., *In Ep. Ad Tit.* 3, 10. Optatus, *De Schism. Donat.* 1. 9.

27 *In Ps.* 57. n. 2.

"outside the Church."[28] And if schismatics have true baptism it comes from the common faith they have purloined from the Church. Their Church does not thrive on what separated them from, but on what joined them to, the Church. It is separated from the bond of charity and peace, but united in the one baptism. "But they think within themselves that they show very great subtlety in asking whether the baptism of "Christ in the party of Donatus makes men sons or not; so "that, if we allow that it does make them sons, they may "assert that theirs is the Church, the mother which could give "birth to the sons in the baptism of Christ; and since the "Church must be one, they may allege that ours is no Church. "But if we say that it does not make them sons, why then, say "they, do you not cause those who pass from us to you to be "born again in baptism, after they have been baptised with us, "if they are not thereby born as yet?—Just as though their "party gained the power of generation in virtue of what consti- "tutes its division, and not from what causes its union with "the Church. For it is severed from the bond of peace and "charity, but it is joined in one baptism. And so there is one "Church which alone is called catholic; and whenever it has "anything of its own in these communions of different bodies "which are separate from itself, it is most certainly in virtue of "this which is its own in each of them that it, not they, has the "power of generation. For neither is it their separation that "generates, but what they have retained of the essence of the "Church."[29]

20. Augustine, indeed, knows full well that there are Jews and heathens who are members of the Church, without belonging to the visible Church; but they are such only in God's fore-knowledge. From this invisible Church proceeds the Church visible, which is the only haven of salvation.[30] Unless they

30 *De Bapt.* 5, 38.

28 *Ep.* 185, 11. 50.

29 *De Bapt.* i. 10, 14. (Clarke's Tr.)

belong to the visible Church they cannot attain to eternal life. "Hold this unhesitatingly and without doubting," says *Fulgentius* of Ruspe, "that not merely the heathen, but Jews "also, and heretics and schismatics, who live out of the "Catholic Church, shall go into everlasting fire."[31] The Africans gradually severed all connection with heretics, whom they regarded as outside the pale of Christianity, and without the circle of its graces.

21. The Greek Fathers, too, were severe in judging heretics, although they had not formed such a complete and consistent idea of the Catholic Church as prevailed in the West. The great Greek Fathers of the fourth century, S.S. Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa, with one concerted voice, condemn heretics for rejecting the Church's doctrine and tearing her unity into shreds. They thought that, to avoid schism, men should be ready to make the heaviest personal sacrifices. Hence S. Athanasius was filled with zeal against the Meletians, and Gregory Nazianzen refers to the example of S. Basil who, afraid lest the monks devoted to him should rise up against the legitimate bishop, because of his negligence, and create a schism, left the city.[32] The General Councils, summoned in the East to condemn heresies, are the strongest proof that the East believed that the one way to salvation is in the one Mother Church.

22. It is quite in conformity with the position taken up by the African Fathers that theirs were the first ecclesiastical utterances upon the aphorism: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* The Donatists by insisting that only saints could be members of the Church, or rightly administer the Sacraments, called in question the entire constitution of the Catholic Church. Against them the Africans were bound to declare explicitly, in what relation the Church stood to man's salvation. But the Canon generally ascribed to an African Synod in 398 A.D.[33]

31. *De Fide ad Petr.* c. 39. Hagemann, *Römische Kirche*, p. 9.
32. *Orat.* 43. 29:
33. Hase, p. 43. See Tournely p. 52.

cannot be adduced in proof, as this Synod of Carthage is unknown to history, and has long since been proved fictitious.[34] Nor do the Canons (104) ascribed to it harmonise with that age. They are a private collection of Canons of different African and Eastern Synods. Hence it is impossible to say where the Canon originated which directed that the following question should be put to ordinandi: "Can any one be saved outside "the Catholic Church?" However, these Canons crept eventually into the ancient Spanish, pseudo-Isidorian collection, and this one was thus incorporated in the Canon Law.[35]

23. It is the same with the Athanasian Creed. As all the world knows, it did not originate with S. Athanasius, but first saw the light in the West or in Africa about the fifth or sixth century. In the matter of *Extra Ecclesiam* etc., it is stamped with the seal of the African Church. By being embodied in the liturgy, it gradually acquired the authority of a symbol. "He who wishes to be saved, must first of all hold fast to the "Catholic faith. Unless he keep this entire and inviolate, he "will surely perish for ever." This creed, in Hase's opinion, became "the symbol of the Roman Church, which, after sepa-"rating from the Eastern Church, carried with it the privilege "of salvation." But the symbol existed long before the Schism, and corresponded with the ancient faith of the Roman Church, which needed, therefore, merely to retain the privilege. We shall see presently how the Roman Church, whose Apostolic succession was more certain than that of all other churches, possessed from the beginning the privilege of the true faith which the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans had already spoken of in terms of highest praise. If she took it with her, then, at all events, till the schism, she was in agreement with the Eastern Church. The Eastern Schismatical Church herself goes now even further, inasmuch as she practically classes the heterodox with the heathen.

34 Hefele, *l.c.* ii. p. 68.
35 *Decret. I. Dist.* 23 c. 8.

24. When, therefore, Boniface VIII. says: "We declare it "to be necessary to salvation that every human creature should "be subject to the Roman Pontiff,"[38] he is merely giving formal expression to the doctrine already put forward by Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, and Leo. It follows from the Scriptural doctrine on the institution and constitution of the Church, and is, as we shall show later, the logical consequence from Matth. xvi. 18 seq. Tertullian, on the strength of Scripture and Tradition, gave utterance to the principle that there is nothing Christian but what is Catholic.[39] Augustine, as we have seen, took it up with warmth and vigour. But their doctrine was not new. It is to be found in nearly set terms in S. Ignatius. The Greek Fathers, as seen in Irenæus, were of the same opinion. Augustine's doctrine became the standard for the schools of the Middle Ages. True, his doctrine on predestination was set aside by Pope Celestine as not being necessary to Catholic doctrine. But from this it does not follow that his doctrine on salvation through the Church alone is also to be set aside. For Augustine himself would protest against such an inference. He considered that alone as Catholic doctrine which the Church generally believed and taught. For the rest his doctrine of predestination is quite independent of the principle that out of the Church there is no salvation; nor did Augustine ever hold, as did the Reformers, that none but saints and the predestined are members of the Church. The doctrine, therefore, of which we speak is coeval and coextensive with the Catholic Church.

25. For this reason a general ecclesiastical decision was subsequently unnecessary. Neither the Scholastics nor modern theologians had any need to set up a "peculiar dogma of salvation," even supposing it had been in their power to do so. But there can be no doubt as to the teaching of both the one and the other on this point. The Scholastics thought it a self-evident truth that the true doctrine of Jesus and the

38 *Extrav. comm.* l. i. tit. 8. c. 1.
39 Hase, p. 73. See Zöckler, II. 748.

Apostles and the right means of grace existed nowhere but in the Church, and that in it alone salvation was to be found. The first, however, to handle the question of the Church systematically was Torquemada. Among the Excellences of the Catholic Church he counts its exclusiveness, according to the axiom: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* This exclusiveness, he says, follows from a two-fold necessity;[40] the necessity of faith and of the sacraments for eternal life. Both are found only in the Catholic Church

For the rest, there are not wanting ecclesiastical documents in which the doctrine is embodied. The *fourth Council of the Lateran* in its profession of faith teaches as follows (c. 1): "There is but one universal Church of the faithful, and "outside it no one at all is saved." The Waldenses, after their conversion, were required to profess faith in one Church; not an heretical Church, but in the Holy, Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which no one is saved. In like manner Eugenius IV., speaking in the name of the Roman Church, teaches that none outside the Catholic Church, whether heathens, Jews, heretics, or schismatics, shall have a share in everlasting life, but that they shall go into eternal fire unless converted before death. And the Council of Trent presupposes this universal belief. The decree on original sin begins with these words: "That our Catholic faith, *without* "*which it is impossible to please God*, may be purified from "errors, and preserved intact and inviolate .... the Synod "decrees, etc." This evidently implies the same doctrine of the one saving Church as is contained in the Athanasian Symbol. The Catholic Church, it says again, instructed by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and His Apostles, and by the Holy Spirit who leads her into all truth, teaches that she possesses and will hold to the true doctrine of the Eucharist, and that therefore she forbids all Christians to think otherwise. The Roman Church is called by the Synod the Mother and

40 *Summa de Eccles.* i. 28. Schwane, iii. 500.

Mistress of others.[41] Pius IV. inserted the words in the profession of faith: "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and "Apostolic Roman Church as the Mother and Mistress of all "Churches." And it concludes with the words: "This true "Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved, I promise "to hold intact and entire until my last breath."

26. Of modern theologians, I shall name but two. Tournely considers that the phrase "*Extra ecclesiam* etc." is one of those truths which are both incomprehensible and hard, because it lays a ban on all heretics and schismatics. "But it is not on "that account less true; for Tradition, from first to last, teaches "that there is no remission of sins, no charity, no salvation "outside the Church." Perrone lays down the following thesis: "For those who culpably depart this life in heresy, schism, "or unbelief, there can be no salvation; in other words, *Extra* "*ecclesiam nulla salus.*" And he begins to demonstrate it with the words: "This thesis, which makes all sectaries and un-"believers gnash their teeth, is clear not only from Scripture "and the constant sense of the Catholic Church, but also "from reason. In fact so clear is it that he who fails to "perceive its truth must be blind."[42]

Pius IX., in his first Encyclical, condemned Indifferentism, and repeated the proposition: "Out of the Church there is no "salvation." And in another Encyclical he thus speaks: "For "we must hold it to be of faith that no one outside the Apos-"tolic Roman Church can be saved. For she is the one ark "of salvation. He who enters her not, will perish in the "flood." *

41 *Sessio* v. Decret. de pecc. orig. *Sess.* xiii. Decret. de SS. Euch. Sacram. *Sessio* xiv. de Extrem. Unct. c. 3. *Sess.* xxv. de Delect. cib.

42 Tournely, p. 52. Perrone, i. 249.

* The proposition, as the author has clearly shown, is old and Catholic, and is, in fact, only the logical conclusion of the doctrine of one visible Church of Christ on earth. As a matter of principle, therefore, Non-Catholics ought not to object to the conclusion, but to the premisses, which assert that Christ instituted and left in His place one only Church. The anger and fury with which the conclusion is assailed seems to be due to the fact that superficial minds consider it as synonymous with, or, at least, as necessarily implying the proposition that "all heretics and schismatics of any and every kind, will be damned." This, of course, is a mon-

27. The Reformers adopted the very same principle. When they cut themselves off from the universal and Apostolic Church, they not only took with them the groundwork of their faith, that is Holy Scripture, but they also claimed to be a rival, infallible, and only true Church. Thus the *Confessio* condemns all heretics: Manichæans, Valentinians, Arians, Eunomians, Mohammedans, and such like; and also the followers of Paul of Samosata, old and new Pelagians, and others who figure in the Apology as Scholastics; the Anabaptists, Donatists, Novatians and others. What else can this mean, but that there is no salvation except through Christ, and through the one Church? The same view is urged against that section of Protestants which went under the name of "Reformed." "If," says the Apology, "our adversaries arrogate to themselves the name Church, we know full well that "the Church is theirs who teach Christ's Gospel, and that the "Church is not with them who defend wicked doctrines in the "teeth of the Gospel."[43] The *formula concordiae* recognizes

strous proposition, and entirely repugnant to Catholic principles and instinct. Such a conclusion could only be drawn, if it were stated that no one can or does belong in any way whatsoever to the Catholic Church, unless he be an actua visible member. There is no such proposition in the whole range of Catholic Theology. What the Catholic proposition in question does imply is that whoever is saved, will be saved because, and in so far as, he is a member of the one Catholic Church on earth. To put the matter in what seems to us an easier form: Granting, then, for argument's sake, that there is but one visible Church, it clearly follows that it is the moral duty of every man to belong to it. His own salvation as well as the will of God, who founded the Church, impose on him this moral obligation which, like every other moral duty, supposes knowledge and free will. Now, a man is accountable only in so far as he knows the duty, and is free to fulfil it. But a man may, without any fault of his, be ignorant of it, or, what is still more common, may be mistaken about it, thinking that he is actually fulfilling it when in reality he is not. To blame or punish such a one, would evidently be contrary to all moral principles. The man who can plead invincible ignorance or inculpable error, is reputed as good as having fulfilled the duty. But the duty remains the same in all cases. Accordingly there may be heretics and schismatics, who are born in heresy and who believe *bonâ fide* that they are in the one Church of Christ, and must consequently be reputed as satisfying as far as they are able the moral duty of belonging to the Catholic Church. But the duty of belonging to that Church remains ever the same The Catholic principle, therefore, requires no modification whatsoever. It is simply and absolutely true. *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* It is simply the self-assertion of the Church as the sole representative of Christ and His work on earth. The principle is directed against those who willingly and knowingly fall away from her, or justify their separation from her —*Tr.*

44 *Confess.* I. i. 3. 4; 2. 2: *Apol.* c. 3. a. 6. *Formul. Conc.*, Proem. II.

the ancient symbols "that express the unanimous consent of "the Christian and Catholic faith, and that contain the con- "fession of orthodox Christians and of the true Church, to "wit, the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian creeds." It likewise anathematizes all heretics, and all propositions at variance with the faith, that have ever been broached in the Church. In connection with the Smalcaldic articles it is said: "We in "nowise concede that bishops are the Church, because they "are not; nor do we hearken to their voice as if they issued "commands or prohibitions in the Church's name. God be "thanked, any child seven years old now knows what the true "Church is; namely the saints, the faithful, and the sheep "who hear the Shepherd's voice."

Luther, in his greater Catechism, says: "Outside this Chris- "tianity, and where this Gospel has no place, there can be "neither forgiveness of sins nor sanctification. Hence all are "far removed from this Church who contend that they seek, "and purchase, and merit sanctification by their own works, "and not through the grace of the Gospel and the remission "of sins." "All who are outside the Christian pale, be they "heathen, Turk, Jew, false Christian or hypocrite, even if they "believe in the one true God and invoke Him, but know not "how He is disposed towards them, cannot promise themselves "God's grace and favour. Therefore they abide in His eternal "wrath, and in everlasting damnation."[44] Of course, he had his doubts and often spoke diffidently as to the truth of this doctrine, and the salvation of the faithful outside the true Church. But despite his teaching as to the invisible Church, into which he was reluctantly driven, Luther could not shake off the idea of the necessity of a visible Church. But he made the community the Church. According to Luther no one attains to faith, except by hearing God's word in the Church. And God has handed over this key of the kingdom of heaven to the community of the faithful.

44 ii. 47. 56. See Melanchthon. *De pecc. orig.* Calv. *Instit.* iii. 24, 4.

Hence Protestant dogma is cognizant of two Churches besides the *ecclesia universalis;* namely, an *ecclesia vera sc. pura* and an *ecclesia falsa sc. impura,* "the former essentially "one with the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, the latter with "the Papal and Roman Church."[45] From this it is concluded[46] that the evangelical notion of the Church is part and parcel of the principle of the Reformers, and that, in addition to the subjective assurance of salvation, the consciousness of belonging to the community of the faithful, that is the Church, is necessary. The clearest conviction of justification by faith in Christ is not sufficient for the Reformed faith, unless it also includes the idea of the community of the faithful, which is necessarily connected therewith, so as to form a counterpart to the Romish Sacrament of Penance. The subjective consciousness of justification by faith and the objective idea of the Church must be mutually connected; for the Church "is "above all things and in every respect the community of the "faithful established by God."

The Calvinists were still more clamorous in their pretensions to be the one religion, out of which there is no salvation. They were thoroughly convinced that the pope was Anti-christ, the man of sin, and the child of destruction, and that the Catholic Church was the Synagogue of Satan. "That all in "communion with him (the pope) are lost, is an article of faith "wherever genuine Calvinism is rampant. It stands in the "Westminster Confession."[47] Nor were the Calvinists less tolerant towards the Lutherans. As they still breathe the old undying hatred towards Rome, so they endeavour, where they can, "to render suspect as liars, as denying the true faith, and "following a false erring theology, all who will not be set on "fire with fanatical zeal for Calvinism." The Lutherans, on their part, were not slow to set up hatred against the doctrine of

45 Zökler, ii: 747.

46 Ritchl, *Rechtfertigung*, i. 164. See Janssen, ii. 176.

47 Döllinger, *Kirche*, p. 277, 286.

Zwingli and Calvin, saying that through its instrumentality the devil was seeking to introduce heathenism, Talmudism and Mohammedanism into the Church.

The Reformers made civil princes the arbiters as to what should be the religion of their country and their subjects. "It "is right and just that magistrates should establish the pure "Gospel and the new Church, extirpate popery, and allow no "foreign doctrine to set foot on the soil." They applied the aphorism: *Cujus regio, illius religio.* It was the duty of kings and princes to decide the religion of their subjects, and to watch over its purity. The Lutheran princes ascribed to themselves this right in so many words in the preamble to the *formula concordiae.* The office, hitherto held by popes and bishops of teaching all men what is necessary for salvation, not according to their own good pleasure, but in accordance with traditional belief, was now discharged by civil princes, too often, alas! by whim and caprice.[48] They decided which was the one Church of salvation, and they required ministers of religion and teachers of theology to take an oath of allegiance to the religion of the country!

28. Later Protestants, have, indeed, considerably toned down these claims and principles. Some of the more thoughtful Protestants, in opposition to their own confession and belief, came to different conclusions, as to their relations to the ancient Church. As time went on and a period of calm reflection set in, their view gained ground. Even Luther could not disguise from himself that it was a bold undertaking "to teach "or believe anything in opposition to the Fathers." "Item, "when one sees that men so much more excellent, intelligent, "and learned, and withal so much holier, as Ambrose, Jerome, "and Augustine, nay the best and greatest part of the world "have so believed and taught." So, for instance, Kepler held that Luther and Melancthon were not to be considered as founders of a new religion, but as party-chiefs, against whose

48 Döllinger, p. 52. Röhm, *Confessionelle Gegensätze* 1887, iii. 7. Janssen, iii. 90.

doctrine an appeal might be lodged to the universal doctrine of the Fathers. The Church of Christ, he thought, was "one and "the same at all times. Rome, Wittenberg, Geneva are but parts of the same "Catholic" Church. He will have nothing to do with Luther so long as he completely excludes Rome from the Church and is unable to distinguish "between the "temple of God, and Him that dwells therein."[49]

29. Non-Catholic Theologians, both of the rationalistic and positive schools, now show a juster appreciation of the Catholic Church, although the old nicknames, flouts and gibes are far from having died out. In the different Churches Hase discerns partial Churches, each containing a portion of truth but none coming up to the ideal Church. Catholicism, according to Zöckler, views the Church chiefly as the institute of salvation founded on the means of grace, while Protestantism mainly looks upon her as the communion of saints. "Catholicism "and Protestantism are the two chief views and tendencies of "Christianity, both in themselves relatively justified. Through-"out the whole course of Church history they overlap and "interpenetrate one another, appearing on the scene either "with truth and moderation, or outbidding one another in "falsehood and excess. After Protestantism, which had been "smothered during the Middle Ages, had burst forth in the "sixteenth century, and had wrested its autonomy from an exclu-"sive and conservative Catholicism, they both gradually lost "their mutual influence upon one another, and oscillated "between extreme objectivity on the one side, and a subject-"ivity hardly less extreme, on the other."[50] This is tantamount to saying that the true Church is, properly speaking, nowhere, since an invisible Church is a mere phantom.

30. Now, the Catholic Church, while maintaining her claim to be the one saving Church, admits a distinction between the

49 Schuster, *Johann Kepler und die grossen Kirchl. Streitfragen seiner Zeit.* 1888, p. 156.

50 Zöckler, ii. 399.

objective doctrine and its subjective application, and recognizes an internal connection and necessary relation between the visible and invisible Church. All in the Catholic Church will not be infallibly saved, nor will all outside it be irretrievably lost. To allow so much is neither to sanction "the ideal Church "of Protestants," nor "to indulge in Jesuitical sophistry."[51] But the Church is thus following in the wake of the Fathers, who also drew a distinction between culpable and inculpable heresy, between voluntary and malicious, and involuntary and well-intentioned schisms. Their judgments often sound harsh, but it should be remembered that, as a rule, they had to deal with heretics and schismatics who had formerly belonged to the Catholic Church. But when this was not the case, and they were dealing with men born in heresy, or who were so from custom or surroundings, they were much more lenient in their judgments.

Only those, says S. Augustine, are heretics, who in the Church of Christ, think perversely, and obstinately refuse to correct their pernicious teachings. "But though the doctrine "which men hold, be false and perverse, if they do not "maintain it with passionate obstinacy, especially when they "have not devised it by the rashness of their own presumption, "but have accepted it from parents who had been misguided "and had fallen into error, and if they are with anxiety seeking "the truth, and are prepared to be set right when they have "found it, such men are not to be counted heretics."[52] Hence he views the baptism of material heretics and formal heretics in a different light. If the recipient be a heretic without any fault of his own, or is baptized by a heretic in a case of necessity, he receives forgiveness of sins and the Holy Ghost.[53] Heretics and schismatics have in common with the Church much that can profit unto salvation those who without fault stand outside her communion; whereas with formal heretics and schismatics

51 Hase, p. 54.
52 *Epist.* 43, 1.
53 *De Bapt.* I. 3; iv. 29.

these things, baptism included, serve for their greater condemnation. For they are as limbs severed from the body, which, while retaining the outward form, have lost life, and are soulless.[54]

31. S. Thomas adopts S. Augustine's words,[55] and points out that they are embodied in the decree of the Canon Law.[56] As a reason he assigns the absence of hostile intention towards the Church's authority. Still, as he proceeds, S. Thomas shows that he is taking the proposition in a narrower sense than S. Augustine, inasmuch as he is speaking of material heresy only in regard to matters that the Church has not yet defined. "But after a decision has been pronounced by the authority "of the universal Church, he who obstinately held out would "be considered a heretic. This authority resides chiefly in the Pope." Moreover, in this and in what follows, S. Thomas is speaking of heretics, still within the Church, who rebel against her authority. After such have been twice admonished, judgment should be passed. And Tournely, commenting on the same passage in Augustine, says: The saint considers as members of the Church those who, if not really in external communion with her, nevertheless sincerely desire to be. These, if they place no obstacle in the way, share in the Church's inward spirit. And other theologians allow that, amid the vast number of heretics, many are only in material error.[57]

32. Modern theologians are unanimous in excluding from salvation none but those obstinately in error; i.e. such as resist the Holy Spirit against their better conviction, or by deliberately shutting their eyes to the truth. But obstinacy does not consist in an externally obtrusive "impetuosity in defending error." For, as is well said in the Roman Catechism:[58] "A man is not "to be accounted a heretic who has once staggered in his faith,

54 *Sermo* 268, 2.
55 ii, ii. q. xi. a. 2. ad 3m et contra. Cf. Leo M., *Ep*: 102, a.
56 *Dist.* 24. q. 3. c. Dixit Apost.
57 Tourneley, p. 58. Reiffenstuel, *De Virt. Theol. Tract.* iv. q, a. a. 19.
58 i. 10, 11. Hase. p. 54.

"but he who setting aside the Church's authority defends "ungodly opinions with an obstinate sense." So that an "obstinate sense," not outward impetuosity, is the turning point. An opponent is easily inclined to assume bad faith or obstinacy in his adversary because he judges faith from his own standpoint; but no man is a judge in this matter which belongs to the domain of conscience and to God alone. The greater the duration of the schism, and the force of custom in matters of religion, the more we should be on our guard against being quick to assume evil intentions.

In the Encyclical in which he condemned indifferentism, and pointed to the Roman Church as the one ark of salvation, Pius IX. warned men not to indulge in idle speculations as to the fate of those who do not belong to the Catholic Church; for they should not pry into God's secret counsels and judgments. Anyhow, he says, it may be taken as certain that they who are in invincible ignorance, are not guilty in God's sight because they know not the true religion. And who would dare to set limits to such ignorance?[59] The Syllabus repeats only such propositions as relate to "Indifferentism."[60] Even Protestants, unless they wish to constitute reason sole arbiter in matters of faith, will hardly quarrel with the theses levelled at Rationalism "At least," so runs the condemned proposition, "we may hope well for the eternal salvation of all who do not "live in the true Church of Christ." This is taken from the above-mentioned Encyclical, and should be explained according to its context. There is nothing captious or insidious about it; the less so because absolute certainty is unobtainable, without a special revelation, even as to the salvation of those who belong to the Church. Hence all are bidden to work out their salvation with fear and trembling.

This mild condemnation of material heresy is described by Hase as "an un-Catholic double-tongued confession." "Taken

59 *Encycl.* Pii ix. 9 Dec. 1854.
60 *Syllab.* 8 Dec. 1864. Prop. 15-18

"in its plain unvarnished sense, it would almost destroy the "idea of heresy, at all events its application to the Protestant "Church. For it was precisely from conscientious anxiety as "to their salvation that our fathers withdrew from the Papal "Church; and that we still protest against it, believing it to be "a distorted Christianity."[61] The argument might fairly be retorted against the man who believes in branch churches, and allows that none, his own included, fully realizes the idea of the Christian Church. But let that pass. We are fully aware that those who are born in Protestantism, have their minds and hearts from youth upwards poisoned against all things Catholic. Many, therefore, are undoubtedly in good faith. Whether the same may be said of all, is another matter. Who can judge of what goes on in the inner conscience of man? of the light he receives and rejects? In this sense we grant that intelligent Protestants from sincere motives do, at times, stay where they are. But it will be difficult for Hase or any one else to show that the authors of the Reformation were guided by sincere anxiety for the salvation of their souls. It is simply a matter of history that the success of the entire movement in the 16th century was owing to worldly rather than conscientious motives, and that the new religion or learning was imposed by sheer force or fanatical misrepresentation upon the common people. It is no argument against us to say that some—e.g., Henry IV. or Winckelman—have become Catholics from worldly motives. Against a few isolated cases there stands a host of distinguished converts even in this age, who, as may be seen from the portraits of converts collected by Räss and Rosenthal, have heroically exchanged all the world could offer for the humility of the cross. Nothing but the purest motives and the supreme concern of life and conscience could have prevailed upon them to take a step so completely at variance with their natural inclinations, their education and prospects in life. Conscience, then, is all on the side of Catholicism. But to return to our

61 P. 53.

point. The distinction between formal and material heresy, between apostates and *bonâ fide* heretics, universally admitted by Catholic Theologians, is anything but uncatholic, or jesuitical sophistry. On the contrary, it is a natural and necessary consequence of the Catholic doctrine. What are called *bonâ fide* heretics must, in all justice and fairness, be morally considered members of the one true visible Catholic Church, though they are not visibly in her communion. Thus it remains true that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.

33.* It may be well here to give a brief survey of the different classes of *members* in the Church, and to show how believers can partake of the graces and blessings belonging exclusively to the Church.

First come those who belong to the Church, both outwardly and inwardly, that is by internal grace and holiness, these may be called the perfect members. If, with God's grace, they persevere to the end, they are sure of salvation.

Side by side with these are others who belong to the same Church in all things external, but whose inner life of grace is either wholly or partially lost, [i.e. they have lost not faith or hope, but sanctifying grace]. The former are real and visible members, though imperfect; the latter are practically dead, and belong to the Church only in outward form, inasmuch as the Christian character was indelibly stamped on their souls in baptism, and they undertook to obey the Church, and to perform the duties of Christian life. So long as they do not constitute too great a danger for the good, they must, according to our Lord's parables, be suffered to remain. For as long as there is life, there is hope that one day they may again become worthy members of the Church. S. Augustine compares the two classes with the sanctuary and the forecourt of the temple. The unclean heathen were not admitted beyond the forecourt while the Sons of Abraham were permitted to enter the sanctuary.[62] As in the ark there were clean and unclean

62 *Contr. Liter. Petil.* iii. 3. *De Bapt.* i. 10. 14; xviii. 26.

animals, so in the Church there are good and bad. "But as "Noe offered the clean and not the unclean animals in sacrifice, "so it is not the wicked but the good that go to God."[63]

The third place is occupied by the catechumens. Though not yet invested with full membership they have placed themselves under the Church's guidance, have accepted her faith, desire baptism, and have resolved to lead Christian lives, in obedience to her rules. They aspire to that full and perfect membership which is conferred by baptism. They stand as it were, in the porch of the Church.

In the fourth place come those who are wholly outside the Church's pale, namely those who are either formal heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicate. They have separated themselves of their own free act and knowledge from the one body. The external bonds are snapped asunder, the internal are a mere rope of sand. These members are branches lopped off and dead. In virtue of their baptism they are still the Church's subjects, and are bound to obey her, and to return to her bosom. So far and no farther there is a radical bond remaining; but in plain speech they are not members.

But mere material heretics or schismatics clearly occupy a middle place. They are neither in external communion with the one visible Church on earth, nor are they wholly cut adrift from her. For they are, as we suppose, baptized; they have faith in Christ and His religion, so far as it has been brought home to them. Now the Sacrament of baptism and the faith preached to them are, as S. Augustine argues in the passage quoted above, taken from the Church, to whom they belong by right; and these are in a sense external bonds. In truth this class of people consider their own communion as *the* one visible Church to which they desire with all their heart to belong. We may therefore call them virtual members. Those only are excluded from the Church who resist the Divine Spirit, i.e. who cling to heresy or schism against their better knowledge and conviction.

63 *C. Donat.* iii. 9: 19.

The bonds, that link men to the Church are as many therefore, and as varied as in the human body. They are external and internal, visible and invisible, essential and accidental. In order to illustrate them in a compendious manner, S. Augustine[64] used a comparison that has since passed into general use—the comparison between the outward and inward man, between the soul and body. Spiritual gifts are the soul of the Church, while external confession of faith and the use of the Sacraments are the body. Those who are inwardly and outwardly joined to the Church belong both to the soul and the body. To the soul, but not to the body, belong people, like Catechumens and excommunicated persons who, though outside the Church, possess faith and charity, while those merely outwardly connected with the Church belong to the body, but not the soul; this last is the lowest grade of membership.[65] Soul and body go together. But while the soul can live without the body, the body without the soul is dead.*

34. The reason for this difference is to be sought in God's mercy to all men. He has, indeed, ordained external means and a visible Church as necessary conditions, but He has been pleased, in condescension to human infirmity, to come to man's aid in an extraordinary manner. Hence the Sacrament of baptism, both as to matter and minister, is so fashioned that

64 L. c. 10, 20.

65 Bellarm. Tom. ii. l. 3, 2. S. Thom. iii. q. viii. a. 3.

* To some the author's remarks in this and the following paragraph will seem singularly inconsistent. On the one hand it is said that all men are bound to become members of the Catholic Church (i.e. of the body of the Church), in order to partake of the life that is in the body (i.e. the life of the soul). On the other hand the life of the soul is said to be obtainable outside the body and independently of it, the soul being more capacious than the body. Hence students are often bewildered when they are told that some belong to the soul of the Church but not to the body. The answer, indeed, may hold good for all practical purposes; but theoretically it is doubtless inaccurate and inconsistent. It is better to say that though men may belong to the body without belonging to the soul, yet no one can belong to the soul, unless he belongs in *some way* to the body; or, as we have remarked in a previous note, unless he satisfies, *to the best of his present abilities*, the moral obligation of belonging to the body of the Church. Now it is easy to see how the *bona-fide* heretic or schismatic satisfies this obligation by the very fact of being in good faith. The same may be said of heathens who are in invincible and inculpable ignorance. Their good faith, then, is, morally speaking, the bond that links them, as far as is possible or necessary, to the body of the Church. Thus the beautiful and expressive

it can be administered everywhere and by everyone. For the same reason the fundamental truths of the Gospel are so easy that all without distinction can apprehend them. Nor does God's mercy stop short here. As the Old Testament was a type of the Church, and remission of sins was possible in view of the redemption to come, so the heathen are not left without all hope and comfort. Here we cannot stop to discuss at what moment the command as to baptism becomes of formal obligation. But, anyhow, it applies in a different manner to those who are aware and to those who are unaware of the existence of baptism. God wishes all men to be saved, and He refuses to no one what is necessary for his salvation. Therefore we conclude that there must be yet another road to salvation open.

Little as the actual life led by the heathen gives ground for sanguine hopes, still they always retain their natural power of knowing God, and the voice of conscience proclaiming his eternal law is ever resounding within them. S. Augustine's phrase, that all the virtues of the heathen were refined vices[66] has never, in this form, been adopted by the Church, notwithstanding its great similarity with the twenty-second Canon of the second Council of Orange (A.D, 529). For the same Synod declares that original sin has neither extinguished the light of reason nor strangled free-will. And the Council of Trent adopted this decree. The Fathers, while painting in colours of

metaphor of body and soul, as applied to the Church, is consistently applied. By the body of the Church is meant (1) the framework or skeleton, namely, Pope, Bishops, Priests, and faithful; (2) the sinews and ligaments, namely, the word of God as preached by authority and obediently accepted; the Sacraments and worship, lawfully administered by the divinely appointed organs. By the *soul* of the Church are meant the internal effects of spiritual life produced by the preaching of the word of God and the Sacraments of the Church; the life of faith, hope and charity, and the supernatural life of grace. From this we see at a glance that the true baptism of heretics, and the divine truth that they still preach, are in reality some of the visible ligaments of the Church, stretched beyond their natural limits, and which may serve to connect those who are in good faith with the body and consequently with the soul of the Church. When, therefore, we say that the Church is necessary for salvation, we must mean the body, unless we either utter an empty tautology, or beg the whole question. *Tr.*

66 *C. Jul.* iv. 3. Ernst, *Die Werke und Tugenden der Ungläubigen nach Augustinus*, Freiburg 1871. On S. Ambrose and other Fathers, see Katholik 1888. i. 372.

glaring hideousness the moral depravity of the heathen, never denied freewill.

It is part of God's providence, says S. Thomas, to come providentially to the aid of each one in all that is necessary to his salvation, if only man, on his side, places no obstacle in the way. "Were a man, bred in the woods or among the "beasts, to follow the natural instinct of his reason by desiring "good and avoiding evil, God would most certainly make "known to such a one what he must believe, either by an "immediate revelation, or by sending a special messenger, as "He sent Peter to Cornelius."[67] Theologians still dispute as to how S. Thomas conceived this preparation for grace. Probably he followed the more severe doctrine of predestination (?). But, in any case, he grants that the one saving Church does not ruthlessly damn all outside her. Dante understood him aright in that beautiful passage in which he points to the child born on the banks of the Indus, where no one breathes the name of Jesus Christ.

"... Here confess reveal'd
That covert, which hath hidden from thy search
The living justice, of the which thou mad'st
Such frequent question; for thou saidst—'A man
Is born on Indus' banks, and none is there
Who speaks of Christ, nor who doth read nor write
And all his inclinations and his acts,
As far as human reason sees, are good
And he offendeth not in word or deed.
But unbaptiz'd he dies, and void of faith.
Where is the justice that condemns him? where
His blame if he believeth not?'"[68]

.... Un uom nasce alla riva
Dell' Indo; e quivi non è chi ragioni
Di Christo, nè chi legga, ne chi scriva.
E tutti suoi voleri ed atti buoni
Sono, quanto umana ragione vede
Senza peccato in vita od in sermoni;
Muore non batterato e senza fede:
Ov' è questa giustizia che 'l condanna?
Ov' è la colpa, sed ei non crede?

(The author, we fear, has misunderstood this passage of Dante. See *Inferno*, Canto iv. 24-42. Tr.

67 *De Verit.* q. xiv. a. 11 ad 1. See Denzinger, *Relig. Erkennt.* i. 164. Fischer, *De Salut. Infidel.* Frib. 1886.

68 Paradiso xix. 70 Cary's Tr.)

S. Thomas' view is followed by most Theologians of our own day.[69] Kant is quite mistaken in supposing that this view was discovered by modern Rationalism.[70] Its only discovery is that one Church is as profitable to salvation as another, and that natural religion is sufficient for all men. To say that it is a dogma of the Catholic and Protestant Churches alike that the heathen are damned,[71] is inexact. For the Catholic Church, while prizing the blessings of Christianity beyond measure, has never yet depreciated the natural gifts and capacities for truth and goodness, which are the groundwork of supernatural religion itself. In both respects she differs from Protestantism. Her idea of justification by grace, is that of a real internal holiness superadded to the natural goodness of man, which consequently has never been lost by the sin and fall of the first man. And modern investigations in the history of religion have justified the Catholic position. For not only is there nowhere to be found a people devoid of religion, but Oriental religious systems are proof positive that rich stores of religious knowledge and morality lie buried in heathenism. Low as man is fallen, God's image is not completely effaced.[72] But the more highly the Catholic Church appraises man's natural powers, the more she is bound to insist on preparation for justification, and on a striving after holiness in those justified. She supposes, of course, that the proofs both for the truth of Christianity, and for the Catholic Church, shine so clearly and and so resplendently, that those who are in an honest search for truth, and become acquainted with her doctrine and history, will be able to find the true faith.

35. These principles determine the Church's attitude towards sinners and her disobedient children, as well as towards heretics and schismatics. She tolerates sinners for the sake of the good, and in the hope that the lost sheep may again return

69 Perone vii. 151. Kleutgen-Oswald.

70 *Natürl. Relig.* Hartmann's Ed. vi. 271, 290.

71 Strauss, *Glaubenslehre* I. 99.

7 Möhler, *l. c.* p. 81.

to the fold. Should success, however, not wait on her efforts, and should she find them stubborn and unyielding, and hardened in resistance, then the Church, according to our Lord's and S. Paul's instructions, is justified in considering such an one as a heathen and a publican, and in delivering his body to Satan, in order that his soul may be saved. Excommunication is a necessary weapon for every independent society that is brought in conflict with malevolent individuals. Hence, says Origen, the Church should have no members but such as are good and holy, but, according to our Lord's words, the cockle must be allowed to grow, and only notorious sinners be weeded out.[73]

36. This seems the place to say a word as to the treatment of heretics in particular. Heretics have always been ranked in the general class of sinners, though heresy be a sin of a specially malignant type. For it was the general belief that shipwreck of the faith could not have been suffered without grave moral fault. Heresy was in itself a sin, and sin is its source. Hence the Fathers did not hesitate to apply to heretics and schismatics the parables of the cockle among the wheat, and of the good and bad fishes (usually explained of the morally good and wicked), although our Lord himself seems to have intended the wider application; for He describes the field as the world, and not the Church. But, their detestation of heresy notwithstanding, they are careful to insist on patience and long-suffering in dealing with the erring, in order to win them back. Exclusion from the Church's pale they require only in order to avert pernicious influences from the faithful.[74] S. Chrysostom, commenting on Matth. XIII. 30, gives excellent advice as to the treatment of those who have gone astray, but he comes to the conclusion that the mouths of obstinate rebels must

73 See Harnack I. 337 Note 3. Schwane I. 722.

74 Chrys. *In Matth.* xiii. 30. Aug. *Epist.* 100, 1, 28. *C. Gaud.* ii. 10. *C. Ep. Manich.* i. *De Unit.* 411. 55. *Ep.* 88; 93; 185. *C. Cresc.* iii. 47. Cyrill. Alex. *In Joan.* xviii. 11. Procop. *Ad Gen.* xxxiv. 2. See Schanz, *Comm in Matth.* p. 344. Rösler, Prudentius, p. 206.

be stopped. Writers who are quick to reproach the Church with severity should not forget that, as a rule, heretics were the aggressors, and would, if they could, have torn in pieces the mother that bore them. Where they gained the upper hand, they put in motion the very laws and principles which they bitterly resented when applied to themselves. This was notably the case with the Donatists in Africa, whose position Augustine confuted by a *reductio ad absurdum*. They readily acquiesced in the emperor's laws against heathen temples, and even put in force, in their own interests, the statutes against heretics as against the adherents of Maximinus; but when the Church pursued the same policy, they cried out: persecution, oppression! S. Augustine says that in his earlier commentaries he had put a milder interpretation on the words: *compelle intrare* (Luke XIV. 23), because he had not then learnt all the wickedness and malevolence of which schismatics and heretics were capable. In proof we need only quote from his Epistle (23, 7.) "I shall not however do this (meet in conference with Bishop "Maximinus and have the letters of both sides publicly read) "in the presence of the soldiery, lest any of you should think "that I wish to act in a violent way, rather than as the interests "of peace demand; but only after their departure, that all who "hear me may understand that I do not propose to compel men "to embrace the communion of any party, but desire the truth "to be made known to persons who, in their search for it, "are free from disquieting apprehensions. On our side there "shall be no appeal to men's fear of the civil power; on your "side, let there be no intimidation by a mob of Circumcelliones. "Let us attend to the real matter in debate, and let our argu-"ments appeal to reason and to the authoritative teaching of "the Divine Scriptures."* Later on, however, when defending the imperial edicts, he formed the opinion that it would do good to use force towards schismatics, because it would compel

* Clark's Tr.

them to listen to the truth, and might eventually lead to their sincere conversion.

37. The Fathers, desiring the sinner's improvement and conversion, would hear nothing of blood-shed. Only in very extreme cases they sought to *justify* the punishment of death; but even then they never advocated or recommended it. Their sharpest strictures were confined to the spiritual sword and spiritual weapons.[75] However severe the judgments passed on heretics and others outside the Church in Patristic times, their punishment, according to the Apostle's teaching, was left to Satan, no kind of external violence or compulsion being used against them.[76]

The first execution of a heretic was carried out by order of a pretender to the empire. Priscillian, indeed, was excommunicated by the Synod of Saragossa (380), but Maximus was not therefore authorized to execute him, along with several of his adherents, at Trier in 385. By declining the investigation of the Bishops at Bordeaux (384), Priscillian surrendered to the secular power. "Lest he should be cross-examined by the "bishops, he appealed to the governor, and thus dug his own "grave." Maximus was certainly urged to take this step by some bishops, but Martin of Tours, Ambrose, Pope Siricius and others discountenanced it. Martin, at great danger to his person, strove to arrest the persecution of heretics. Leo the Great, in his letter to Turribius, while approving the act in itself, proves that Priscillian was put to death more as a traitor than as a heretic. "Rightly, indeed, our Fathers, in whose "day this godless heresy broke out, had recourse to every "earthly measure to stamp it out of the Church. And with all "the more reason, as secular princes stood in such abhorrence "of this delirious teaching that they cut down its author and "many of his followers with the sword. For they knew full "well that honesty would vanish, the marriage tie be snapped

75 Zöckler, *Hieronimus*, p. 438.

76 Langen, *Das Neue Testam. bei den Kirchenvätern*, p. 119.

"asunder, and all divine and human law be a heap of ruins, "if men who taught such doctrines were allowed to live. "For a long time the Church, gentle herself, profited by "this secular severity; for, content with episcopal deci- "sions, she forbears to punish by shedding blood. Still "she is supported by the severe laws of Christian princes, "since those who dread corporal punishment frequently fly "for refuge to spiritual remedies."[77] The legislative enactments framed by the emperors against the Manichæans and Donatists were, to some extent, harsh, but the death penalty was reserved for the most extreme cases.

38. The Gnostic and Manichæan views on marriage and the family, authority and property were transmitted by various channels to the Middle Ages, and compelled the secular and ecclesiastical authorities to keep a sharp outlook. The more the two powers worked together for a common end, the clearer it became that the "secular arm" should support the spiritual in keeping the faith pure, in preserving unity, and in protecting the foundations of moral and social life. In the time of Gregory VII., death was constituted the penalty for formal heresy. S. Thomas and other scholastics defend it, indeed, but uniformly restrict it to those who obstinately persist in their error. "The Church, "filled with compassion, seeks the conversion of him who "goes astray, and hence, following the Apostle's instruc- "tions, does not condemn him till after the first and second "admonition. But then, if he still continues obdurate, the "Church, no longer entertaining any hope of his conversion, "looks to the interests of others by excommunicating him. "In the last resort, she delivers him to the secular arm, "that death may rid the world of him."[78] The principles which justify this course of procedure may, with S. Thomas, be briefly summed up in the fact that heretics have

77 Ep. 15, 1. On S. Martin, see Sever. *Dial.* iii. 11. Rösler, *l. c.* p. 15. *Kirchenlexicon*, 1 ed. vi. 906; viii. 779.

78 ii. ii. q. xi. a. 3. 4.

falsified true doctrine. If they who utter base coin are severely punished, why should one be fastidiously indulgent towards men who lead souls astray? In that age false teachers were adjudged as offenders against society. And the justice of this view will hardly be disputed when it is remembered that some, like the Cathari and Albigenses, tried to undermine the moral foundation of society.[79] In turn they laid siege to marriage, pulled down the fabric of property, and laid all authority level with the dust. Hence Church and State felt bound to take up arms in self-defence.

39. All this resulted in the establishment of the Inquisition, the first beginnings of which reach back as far as 1184. Frederick II. (1224) and Gregory IX. (1231) ordered obstinate heretics to be burnt to death. The secular power carried the sentence into execution, to save the principle: *Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem, ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*—The Church thirsts not for blood, the Church abhors blood (Nicholas I.). Of course the spiritual judges knew full well the fate that awaited the poor wretches delivered over to the secular arm. For these proceedings were adopted and sanctioned by Canon Law. But the fact that the civil power considered heresy a crime deserving of death, proves that this tribunal was thoroughly in accord with the spirit of the age, and not the outcome of ecclesiastical ambition or intolerance. The history of the Inquisition shows, too, that the Inquisition, more particularly in Spain, was an instrument in the hands of Princes for making away with obnoxious clerics or laymen. Before the battle of Cappel, Clement VII. interceded with the Catholic Cantons for the Zwinglians. Paul III. admonished Francis I. to be lenient and to forego the punishment of death; Pius V. warned Philip II. of Spain not to shed blood in the Netherlands; Innocent XI. condemned the dragonnades of Louis XIV. The Catholic Parliament of Paris (1555-1559) voted against putting heretics to death. These facts should not be

79 Döllinger, l.c. p. 51. Funk, 296. Hergenröther, ii. 483.

lost sight of by those who make capital out of Gregory XIII.'s glorification of the S. Bartholomew massacre (which under the circumstances was excusable) and the rejoicing of Innocent XI. over the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Nowadays no one will commend all this, or excuse all abuses, or would desire a return to those times and customs. Still, if we would be just, we must judge of events in the light of time and contemporary circumstances. Various elements were abroad that were a danger to Church and State. Hostile Moors and Jews occupied Spain, and under a Christian mask were making war on Christianity. All this demanded the keenest vigilance. Every age chooses the means that best suit its dominant ideas. Many nations were then in a state of flux and formation, and required stringent laws. The civil law, too, dealt out heavy punishments. Taking our stand on our advanced civilization, it is easy to form an adverse judgment; but it is difficult to say by what other method savage peoples could have been civilized. The boy is not trained into a perfect man without severity and firm treatment. In the oath still taken by bishops there is, indeed, the passage: *Hæreticos pro posse persequar.* But in Germany, at least, it is omitted, and, in any case, it must be interpreted according to modern ecclesiastical principles and customs. A bishop's duty is to preserve the faith pure and entire in his diocese. A spiritual campaign against heresy, in the spirit of Christian charity and pastoral solicitude, is also certainly part of a Catholic bishop's duty. Such a campaign Protestants are constantly conducting against Rome and the Catholic Church. Why should not Catholics be allowed to do the same? Again, if States exclusively Catholic are unwilling to allow a footing to another creed, it is surely not for those to complain from whom emanated the axiom *cujus regio, illius religio.* And then, it must be remembered, there is a great difference in point of right. Catholics are defending a right of long standing, sanctioned by ages; they are in possession, while Protestants

are encroaching, innovating, disturbing.[80] For the rest, Protestants have adopted the same principle of exclusiveness. Many Northern States uphold it to this day. To the principle itself, no one but a Rationalist can object. The lowest estimate of Christianity will suffice to feel that unity of faith is a national boon. Moreover, that unity is intimately bound up with public peace and order. And, assuredly, unity of faith and public order are a greater good than freedom of worship.[81] The real question at issue is, who has the right to apply the principle? The Catholic Church has both a divine right, in virtue of her divine institution and Apostolicity, and the human right of possession which she cannot forfeit in any age or country. Protestants, as we have said, claim and exercise the right to be exclusive, with regard to other communities, wherever they are in the ascendant.[82]

40. Now that we are discussing the principle of religious toleration, we may ask, what was the teaching of the Reformers on this head? Did not they follow the very maxim that they censured so severely in others? Did not Luther find his chief delight in cursing the Pope? Did he not call upon Christians "to seize the Pope, and all the popish entourage of idolatry? "to tear out the tongues of the accursed crew by the roots?" to pitch into the sea "all the hateful scoundrels, bag and "baggage—Pope, and Cardinals, and the whole papal rabble?" Köhler cooly remarks: "Luther, as well as the whole age of "the Reformation, had not discovered the golden means "between the principle of liberty of conscience and the moral "duty of rulers to protect religion; hence it is not to be "wondered at, if he has strongly contradicted himself on this

80 Döllinger, p. 51. 63.—The above remark of the author deserves special attention. It is often said that Queen Elizabeth, in persecuting Catholics, did but apply the principle of her Catholic predecessors. What then? The question is what right had she so to act? Unless we proceed on Erastian principles, it must be admitted that Catholics, both as a body and as individuals, had the human as well as the divine right of possession on their side. Hence her persecution was absolutely unjust, illegal, and tyrannical.—*Tr.*

81 Döllinger, p. 88. 485. Syllabus, Prop. 77.

82 Hase, p. 57. Perrone, I. 290. Syllab. Prop. 96.

"point." Luther, Brenz, Bucer, Capito, teach that all heretics should be extirpated, and the "meek and gentle" Melancthon seeks to defend this doctrine. Döllinger, an unprejudiced witness, thus writes: "The Protestant theory of the absolute "authority of the State in ecclesiastical matters made it im-"possible for the civil power to be tolerant. Historically, "nothing can be less true than the assertion that the Reforma-"tion was a movement in favour of liberty of conscience. The "precise contrary is the truth. Lutherans and Calvinists, "indeed, like all men in every age, claimed liberty of "conscience for themselves, but it never occurred to them, "when they had the upper hand, to extend it to others. The "complete suppression and extirpation of the Catholic Church "was the goal of all the Reformers. From the very first they "called upon princes and magistrates to abolish by force the "ritual of the ancient Church. In England, Ireland, Scotland, "and Sweden, they proceeded to such extremes as to punish "every exercise of the Catholic religion with death."[88] Were authentic statistics forthcoming as to the number of those who suffered for the Catholic faith in these countries, the number of victims would, at the very least, be as great as those who suffered, often on purely secular grounds, at the hands of the Inquisition. Hase gives the numbers furnished by Llorente, who has long since been unmasked; but he adds, as in duty bound, that the can lay no claim to be completely trustworthy. Perhaps he thought that the end sanctifies the means.

Protestant Scholastics were far more intolerant, not merely to Catholics but also to Reformers and in regard of other creeds, than the Catholic Schoolmen had ever been.

Calvin, in his work, "*De hæreticis jure gladii coercendis*," declares that it is allowable in the civil power to punish heretics. And he puts his contention on the same ground as the old Scholastics had done. "I ask you," he exclaims, "whether it "be right that heretics should murder souls, by poisoning them

83 *L. c.* p. 68. See Janssen, ii. 378; iii. 17. 50. 80. 106; iv. 334; v. 138.

"with errors, and that we should prevent the sword from "taking their lives as God commanded?" The mere revolt on the part of heretics against the kingdom set up by God seemed to him fully to justify the penalty of death. Hence he counselled magistrates to employ every means to render heretics incapable of doing harm. His friend Beza declared liberty of conscience a devilish doctrine and a devilish liberty. He wanted Anti-trinitarians, even if they recanted, to be put to death. And so Michael Servetus had to expiate his errors with his death. The several Calvinist churches were not ashamed to give proofs in writing that the civil magistrates were justified and in duty bound to draw the sword against all heretics, i.e. all non-Calvinists.[84] "Kings and statesmen, theologians "and philosophers, were all agreed, that neither Catholics nor "any Church or party that swerved from the established Church "should be tolerated." "Everywhere," says even Niebuhr, "in England, Scotland, and Geneva, Calvinism erected as many "blood stained scaffolds as the Inquisition, but without any of the "merits of these Catholic institutions." But in North America, Maryland, colonized by the Catholic Lord Baltimore, was the home of freedom of conscience and religious tolerance. In 1649 the General Assemby passed the first American toleration act.

A Protestant author, not very partial to Catholics, thus writes on Luther: "His propositions as to the necessity of employing "secular coercion in matters of faith; his conception of the "Church, and his ideas of the clerical state, seemed a mere "resuscitation of memories that had lain in the depths of his "soul from an earlier period of his life."[85] In regard to the punishment of heretics, Luther put forward the same views as those in which the opposite party acted, and which commonly

84 Döllinger, p. 154. Niebuhr, *Nachgel. Schriften*, Hamburg, 1842, p. 288, 24. Döllinger, p. 123. Lämmer, *Instit. des Kan. Rechtes.* Freiburg, 1886, p. 293. Protestant reply by Köhler, in *Theol. Liter. Zeits.* 1888. Nr. 4. See also *Hist. Pol. Blätter*, 1888, 101, 4-6. Art. *Tolerans und Intolerans.*

85 Keller, *Die Reformation*, p. 361, 446, 460.

prevailed in theory and practice. "If the 'brethren' had "cherished the hope that in the new church a certain toleration "would be extended at least to the ancient churches, they were "quickly undeceived. If under the Roman Inquisitors they "had been chastised with rods they were now to be flogged "with scorpions, and the blood of the poor flowed like water." Even Melancthon wanted Anabaptists to be killed.

How is it, that the Reformers clung to the principle? was it owing to external circumstances rather than to their new religion? Fear cannot be alleged as the motive, because the Reformers were well protected under the wing of the secular princes. "The reason (especially after 1552) for the resolute "adhesion to the principle of compulsion in faith lay in the "circumstances that it was intimately bound up with the entire "doctrinal system. Hence they were compelled either to "secure the fabric by punishing heretics, or, by waiving the "point, to shake the entire fabric to its foundation. And the "case stands in the same position to this day. To deny com-"pulsion in matters of faith would make a breach in the "system, that would inevitably result in its total collapse." It is quite irrelevant to say that Protestants so acted in contradiction to the essential principles of their Church, "thinking it in "its transient form to be infallible and necessary to salvation," but that Catholics acted up to their belief (Hase); for the Reformers must have been well acquainted with a principle they so vigorously applied. If the principle was then historically justified, and if for several centuries it has exacted holocausts in many lands, it cannot be a misrepresentation to connect it essentially with their faith. It was only given up because it could no longer be enforced. In England, says Döllinger, after a struggle lasting for a century and a half, amid pools of blood, in contradiction with the essential principles of primitive Protestantism, men at last gained, by dint of hard fighting, the liberty not to belong to the State-Church.

Hase finds "some excuse for intolerance in the revolutionary

"designs of the Anabaptists which were closely connected "with the uprising of the peasantry, and threatened to pull "down all social order." But he forgets that Luther raved against ecclesiastical and imperial authority, and was not wholly guiltless of the destruction of social order consequent on the revolt of the peasantry[86]

Protestants glory in their Church being the Church that protests "against creature authority," and is "in accordance "with the ordinances of Scripture in regard to Church life"[87] Had not the Anabaptists, from their point of view, the right to make a like protest? Catholics are severely censured for describing Protestantism as "an act of rebellion against the "authority of the Church;" but what else is the Protestant whimsical protest? Of course every man can justify his position from his own point of view. Was there ever a heresy that could not? Protestants, then, as well as Catholics, have reason to call to mind "milder and gentler feelings," to remember the Christian spirit "that has ever silently protested against it."[88] The *Catholic* Church was inspired by this spirit from the beginning. She has inflicted punishment not for its own sake, but because the eternal salvation of men was hanging in the balance.

41. But to bring this discussion to a close. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is consistent throughout. The admission that baptism may be validly administered outside the Catholic Church, and that sins are forgiven, and graces imparted in heretical communities, in no way contradicts what some are pleased to call the "monopoly of salvation" theory. For that admission is as old as the Church. Again, if excommunication which, according to Catholic belief, "is an exclusion from the "one Church of salvation, and a handing over of the soul so "ousted to Satan," is not irrevocable because the curse can be

86 Keller, p. 398. Jenssen, ii. 409.

87 Schmidt, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1837. p 624. Hase, p. 55.

88 Hase, p. 50. See Döllinger, p. 75, 81, 137, 153, 378

undone, this is not "toning down the doctrine," but following the example of the Apostles. The Church has but one wish for those outside her communion; that they may, to the best of their knowledge and conviction, strive after truth and do good. Our Lord Himself who, with infinite patience and forbearance, suffered a Judas in the circle of His Disciples, and was ever seeking to win over Jews and unbelievers, is her model.[89] She follows the axiom laid down by S. Augustine: "Spare the men, but slay their errors." On Good Friday she prays for all men in all states and conditions of life: for Jews and unbelievers, for heretics and schismatics, that God may bring them to the knowledge of His truth.[90]

89 Cypr., *De don. pat.* c. 6. Aug., *Serm.* 49, 8. Chrys., *De anath.* c. 4.
90 See *Cat. Rom.* iv. 5, 2.

CHAPTER X.

THE CHURCH HOLY.

1. From the earliest times, according to the introduction of S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, *Holiness* has been regarded both as a *property* and as a *mark* of the true Church. Our Lord Himself sanctified His Church that she might be without spot or wrinkle. Hence sanctity* must be a sign that can be recognized. It must appear outwardly and become visible to all. This is the necessary condition of a mark as distinguished from a property. No doubt prevails among the different confessions that the Christian Church must be regarded as the holy Church, both by reason of her divine origin, the end for which she was instituted, her doctrine and means of sanctification, and her guidance by the Holy Spirit. On this point all are agreed. The dispute begins when it becomes a question of deciding which Church preeminently possesses these characteristics, and how they are to be recognized.

2. In ancient times this dispute existed only in so far as certain sects—like the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists—set themselves up as rivals to the Church, and laid claim to exclusive sanctity. They sought to establish the divine origin of their own conventicle, either by posing as the Church of the Holy Spirit, or by charging the Catholic Church with laxity, and with having fallen from her primitive sanctity. They were bound to pervert both the idea of the Church, and that of

* For the meaning and definition of the word, see Note 23 at the end of this chapter. Tr.

her sanctity. They took the words "saints" and "sanctity," in a subjective sense, and contended that none but real saints could be members of the Church, or dispense the means of grace in the Church. The Fathers, while emphasizing to their fullest compass the necessity of sanctity, never favoured this extreme view. But they found the Church holy, because she possesses the true doctrine and all the means of grace instituted by Christ, and because she is the temple of God and the Holy Spirit.

3. According to *Origen* the distinction between Church and Synagogue lies in this, that the "true Church is without spot "or wrinkle or any such thing, and is holy and blameless."[1] Hence heathens and sinners are not admitted into the Church until, "after the tenth generation and in the fulness of time," (Deut. XXIII. 3.) they have first been sanctified. "The synagogue, "on the contrary, was built by a centurion before Christ's "coming, and before the testimony was given of Him, so that "his faith was greater than that which God the Son had found "even in Israel." S. *Cyprian* gives heartfelt thanks to God the Father, and to His Christ, our Lord and Redeemer, because, by the return to the Church of those who confessed the Catholic faith in Rome, "the Church is taken under the divine pro-"tection in such a way that the unity and sanctity are placed "beyond the danger of being infected with the stubbornness "and rebellious spirit of reprobate heretics." "These confessors "abjuring error and forsaking schismatics and heretical de-"lusions have again entered, sound in faith, the abode of "truth and unity."[2] S. *Athanasius* explains the stream of the river which maketh the city of God joyful (Ps. XLV. 5), to be the word of the Gospel that rejoiceth the heart of the Church. "The Most High hath sanctified His tent." "For He is holy, "as He reposeth and dwelleth in the holy, i.e. in the Church." Apostles and Evangelists he calls streams (Ps. XCII. 3) because

1 *De Orat.* c. 20.
2 *Ep.* 51, 1. Epiph., *C. Haer.* 23 1.

they water the Church of God with "spiritual living "waters." (John VII. 38). "The Church," says S. *Cyprian*, "openly displays her glory, and grows in the renown of "her beauty. She has no stain to efface or spot to conceal. "Her doctrine is bright as the rays of light." This sanctifying truth (John XVII. 17-19) is found nowhere but in the Catholic Church, and constitutes the first element of her sanctity.

4. A further element of sanctity consists in her means of grace. He who leaves her, abandons the fountains of living water, and diggeth to himself cisterns, containing either none, or only polluted water. "Our Saviour calls on all "who thirst to come and drink of the streams of living "water that flow from his body. To whom shall the thirsty "soul go? To heretics, who have no fount or stream of "living water at all, or to the Church which is one, "and is built by the word of the Lord on one, who has received the Lord's keys? This is the one that is invested "with all the power of the Lord and bridegroom." "The "genuine, salutary, and holy water of the Church cannot "be poisoned or polluted, but is as untainted, pure, and "chaste as the Church herself. If heretics surrender to "the Church, and are in the Church, they can put to use "their baptism and the other spiritual blessings they have "received. But if they are not in the Church, or lift up "their hand to strike her, how can they be baptized with "the Church's baptism?"[3] We have always so acted "as to acknowledge but one Church, and to consider no "baptism but that of the Church as holy." So argues S. Cyprian, from his own one-sided stand-point, overlooking the universal character of baptism; but the main idea underlying his argument, that nowhere but in the Church can the fullness of sanctification and the riches of the gifts of the Holy Ghost be obtained, was quite correct and caught up by S. Augustine, and the Church at large. An admission of the validity of heretical baptism does not involve, as Cyprian wrongly inferred, the further admission that, once

3 Cyr., *Ep.* 73, 11; 75, 19. Cf. Zeno Veron., *Tract.* ii. 77.

heretical baptism is acknowledged, all the gifts of grace might be received out of the Church. The man sanctified in baptism is a temple of God and the Holy Spirit, but only if he has the true faith; for he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.

The emperor Constantine, in his address to the "assembly of the saints" dedicated to the Church,[4] speaking of the change that had been wrought in heathen viciousness through redemption, says: "Jesus Christ having enriched the earth with the "virtues of chastity, wisdom and temperance, when He returned "to His Father's mansion, founded His Church [on earth] to "be a holy temple of virtue, which was to remain pure for ever, "and in which sacrifice and worship were to be offered to the "supreme God, His Father, and to Himself." He addresses the Church as the "protectress of tender and inexperienced "age, who is all truth and gentleness, from whose inexhaustible "source stream the waters of eternal life." The words of the Psalmist: "Sanctity becometh thy house," (Ps. XCII. 5), S. Athanasius applies to the Church. "His house is the Church. "It is, indeed, fitting that she should be holy, as he dwells in "her; who alone is holy. But when this has come to pass, "she will attain endless sanctity." "His sanctification is the "Church, which is holy and glorious. For the Church's jewels "are magnificent." (Ps. xcv. 6).

S. Leo extols the grace that in Christ has been given to all men, in order that all, by observing Christian discipline, may strive for holiness. Christ, by fulfilling it, became the end of the Law, and transformed, in the New Testament, the sacraments of typical promises. "What the Son of God has done "or taught for the reconciliation of the world, we not only learn "from the history of past events, but we know and feel its "power from its present effects. He who by the Holy Ghost "was born of a virgin mother, makes, by the operation of the "same Holy Spirit, the Church a fertile mother, so that by the

4 Euseb., *Vita Const.* v. 1; iv. 32. Cyrill. Hier., *Cat.* xxviii. 25. 26. Chrysost. *Homil.* in II Tim. vi. 2.

"birth of baptism an endless multitude of children of God "are born." "The whole body of the Church is so adorned "by God with numberless gifts of grace, that the many rays of "this new light make her always shine with the same splendour ". . . . this is that true light which justifies and enlightens "every man."[5]

5. The full development, however, of the doctrine of the Sacraments—that is, the means of grace and sanctity—was reserved for the Scholastics. These began to draw the line more sharply between the Sacraments and the Sacramentals, which are exorcisms and blessings for the protection of persons and things against evil spirits The seven sacraments now stood out as a solid, sacred circle; their number, and relations with one another and with their common centre, the Blessed Eucharist, as Sacrament and Sacrifice, were more closely enquired into and defined. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in which Christ's sufferings and death are solemnly commemorated, and the bloody sacrifice of Calvary is renewed in an unbloody manner, appears as the source of all the grace that streams forth to the faithful, through the Sacraments, like channels. To man, weighed down by sin and life's heavy burden, it must be a thought of wonderful consolation, merely to know that this unbloody sacrifice is the realization of that pure sacrifice which the prophet Malachias foretold was to be offered to God in every place. But far greater comfort and strength will he derive from the thought that on the altar He is present who has said: "Come to me all you that labour and are burdened, "and I will refresh you." (Matth. XI. 28).

6. The other Sacraments are so clustered round this centre of Christian life and grace that they may be compared to a crown of choice fresh flowers whose penetrating fragrance serves to permeate, ennoble and transform man's entire life. The Schoolmen were fond of pointing out how admirably the seven Sacraments are adapted for sanctifying the whole range

5 *Sermo.* 62 (63) 6. 7.

of human life. Seven was always considered a sacred number, and it could hardly be without deep signification in the case of the Sacraments. Alexander Hales thinks that they are so adapted by reason of their bearing on the ills and maladies of the soul and society, or because of the relation in which they stand to the virtues that are specially given by the several graces. S. Bonaventure adds that they give the graces necessary in the different stages of the struggle to those who conquer the kingdom of God. S. Thomas draws a parallel between the material and spiritual life, and their respective needs, and shows how the seven Sacraments minister to the needs of the soul.[6]

To give an idea how this theme is developed, we subjoin the explanation of the Roman Catechism, which in the main follows S. Thomas:—

"But why they are neither more nor less in number may be "shown, with some probability, even from the analogy that "exists between natural and spiritual life. In order to live, to "preserve life, and to contribute to his own and to the public "good, these seven things seem necessary to man:—namely, to "be born—to grow—to be nurtured—to be cured when sick—to "be strengthened when weak;—next, as regards the common-"wealth, that magistrates, by whose authority and power it may "be governed, be never wanting—and, finally, to perpetuate "himself and his species by the propagation of legitimate off-"spring. Analogous, then, as all those things obviously are to "that life by which the soul lives to God, from them will be "easily inferred the number of the Sacraments. For the first "is baptism, the gate, as it were, to all the rest, by which we "are born again to Christ. The next is confirmation, by virtue "of which we grow up, and are strengthened in Divine Grace: "for, as S. Augustine bears witness: To the Apostles, who "had not already been baptized, the Lord said, 'Stay you in

6 Alex. Hal. *Summ. Theol.* iv. a. 8. Membr. 7. a. 2. Bonav., *Brevil.* vi. c. 3. Thom. iii. q. 65. a. 1. *Catech Rom.* ii. 2. 15.

"'the city till you be endued with power from on high.' (Ep. "108). The third is the Eucharist by which, as by a truly "celestial food, our spirit is nurtured and sustained; for of it "the Saviour has said 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my "'blood is drink indeed. (John vi. 56). "Penance follows "in the fourth place, by the aid of which lost health is restored, "after we have received the wounds of sin. The fifth is "extreme unction, by which the remains of sin are removed, "and the energies of the soul are invigorated: for, speaking "of this Sacrament, S. James has testified thus: 'If he be "'in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' (James v. 15). Order "follows, by which power is given to exercise perpetually in "the Church the public ministry of the Sacraments, and to "perform all the sacred functions (Acts xiii. 2 sq.; I Tim. iv. "14; II Tim. i. 6). Lastly, is added matrimony that, by the "legitimate and holy union of man and woman, children may "be begotten and religiously brought up to the worship of God, "and the conservation of the human race." (Eph. v. 31, sq.)

7. To this utterance from an ecclesiastical quarter, we may be allowed, perhaps, to add one from a profane source. We would recall the celebrated passage from Goethe on the Sacraments of the Catholic Church. Goethe often spoke of the deep impression made on his sensitive mind by the ceremonies and worship of the Catholic Church, as may be seen in the account of his travels and his notes upon his sojourn in Rome. How beautifully, for instance, he describes his journey to Einsiedeln, where he met pilgrims walking in procession, chanting and praying. "We saluted them as they passed by: "they filled these lonely hills with life and animation, and gave "it all a singular and characteristic charm; we felt spon-"taneously moved to join our voices with theirs in this pious "concert. We were drawn into the living current as it moved "along the road we ourselves intended to take, and which "became all the more easy and pleasant. The practices of the "Roman Church are most important and imposing to a

"Protestant, who only looks at their inward cause from which "they spring, and by which they are transmitted from generation "to generation, without considering, for the moment, the out-"ward forms, the tree, the branches, the leaves, its bark and "roots. The root lies deep in human nature."[7]

Protestant worship, Goethe thinks, is too bare and empty. In examining it in detail, one finds that Protestants have too few Sacraments, nay they have but one in which the individual man takes any active part, the Lord's Supper. And yet the Sacraments, he says, occupy the highest place in religion. They are sensible signs of an extraordinary favour and divine grace. At the Lord's Supper earthly lips are meant to receive a divine Being in a bodily form; and under the guise of earthly food, to partake of heavenly nourishment. Such is the meaning in all the Christian Churches. But such a Sacrament, he proceeds, cannot stand alone. No Christian could relish it with true joy, unless he were filled with the sense of the symbolical or sacramental, and unless that sense were constantly nourished in him. "He must be accustomed to view the inward religion of "the heart and that of the visible Church as *one*, as the great "and universal Sacrament that again resolves itself into many "others, and communicates to them its holy, indestructible and "everlasting character."

Goethe then draws a poetical and highly coloured picture of the organism of the Sacraments in the Catholic Church, by deftly describing the analogy between natural life and the spiritual needs of the human heart: "The Protestant service "has too little fitness and consistency to be able to hold the "congregation together; hence it easily happens that members "secede from it, and either form little congregations of their "own, or, without ecclesiastical connexion, quietly carry on "their citizen-life side by side. Thus for a considerable time "complaints were made that the Church-goers were diminishing "from year to year, and just in the same ratio, the persons

7 *Aus meinem Leben.* Sämmt. Werke. Hullgart 1868. xii. 248.

"who partook of the Lord's Supper. With respect to both, but "especially the latter, the cause lies close at hand; but who "dares to speak it out? We will make the attempt.

"In moral and religious, as well as in physical and civil "matters, man does not like to do anything on the spur of "the moment; he needs a sequence from which results habit; "what he is to love and perform, he cannot represent to himself "as single or isolated, and if he is to repeat anything willingly, "it must not have become strange to him. If the Protestant "worship lacks fulness in general, so let it be investigated in "detail, and it will be found that the Protestant has too few "Sacraments, nay, indeed, he has only one in which he himself "is an actor,—the Lord's Supper; for baptism he sees only "when it is performed on others, and is not greatly edified "by it. The Sacraments are the highest part of religion, the "symbols to our senses of an extraordinary divine favour and "grace. In the Lord's Supper earthly lips are to receive a "divine Being embodied, and partake of an heavenly, under "the form of an earthly, nourishment. This sense is just the "same in all Christian Churches; whether the Sacrament is "taken with more or less submission to the mystery, with more "or less accommodation as to that which is intelligible; it "always remains a great holy thing, which in reality takes the "place of the possible or impossible, the place of that which "man can neither attain nor do without. But such a Sacrament "should not stand alone; no Christian can partake of it with "the true joy for which it is given, if the symbolical or sacra-"mental sense is not fostered within him. He must be "accustomed to regard the inner religion of the heart and "that of the external Church as perfectly one, as the great "universal Sacrament, which again divides itself into so "many others, and communicates to these parts its holiness, "indestructibleness and eternity.

"Here a youthful pair give their hands to one another, not "for a passing salutation, nor for the dance; the priest

"pronounces his blessing upon them, and the bond is "indissoluble. It is not long before this wedded pair bring a "likeness to the threshold of the altar; it is purified with holy "water, and so incorporated into the Church, that it cannot "forfeit this benefit but through the most monstrous apostasy. "The child in the course of life practises himself in earthly "things of his own accord, in heavenly things he must be "instructed. Does it prove, on examination, that this has been "fully done, he is now received into the bosom of the Church "as an actual citizen, as a true and voluntary professor, not "without outward tokens of the weightiness of this act. Now "is he first decidedly a Christian, now for the first time he "knows his advantages, and also his duties. But, in the "meanwhile, much that is strange has happened to him as a "man; through instruction and affliction he has come to know "how critical appears the state of his inner self, and there will "constantly be a question of doctrines and of transgressions; "but punishment shall no longer take place. For here, in the "infinite confusion in which he must entangle himself, amid the "conflict of natural and religious claims, an admirable expedient "is given him, in confiding his deeds and misdeeds, his "infirmities and doubts, to a worthy man, appointed expressly "for that purpose, who knows how to calm, to warn, to "strengthen him, to chasten him likewise by symbolical "punishments, and at last by a complete washing away of his "guilt, to render him happy and to give him back, pure and "cleansed, the tablet of his manhood. Thus prepared and "purely calmed to rest by several sacramental acts, which, on "closer examination, branch forth again into minuter sacra-"mental traits, he kneels down to receive the Host; and that "the mystery of this high act may be still enhanced, he sees the "chalice only in the distance; it is no common eating or "drinking that satisfies; it is a heavenly feast which makes him "thirst after heavenly drink. Yet let not the youth believe "that this is all he has to do; let not even the man believe it.

"In earthly relations we are at last accustomed to depend on "ourselves, and even then, knowledge, understanding and "character will not always suffice; in heavenly things, on the "contrary, we have never finished learning. The higher feeling "within us which often finds itself not even truly at home, is, "besides, oppressed by so much from without, that our own "power hardly administers all that is necessary for counsel, "consolation and help. But to this end, that remedy is "instituted for our whole life, and an intelligent, pious man is "continually waiting to show the right way to the wanderers, "and to relieve the distressed.

"And what has been so well tried through the whole life, is "now to show forth all its healing power with tenfold activity at "the gate of death. According to a trustful custom, inculcated "from youth upwards, the dying man receives with fervour those "symbolical, significant assurances, and then, when every "earthly warranty fails, he is answered by a heavenly one, of a "blessed existence for all eternity. He feels himself perfectly "convinced that neither a hostile element, nor a malignant "spirit, can hinder him from clothing himself with a glorified "body, so that, in immediate relation with the Godhead, he "may partake of the boundless happiness which flows forth from "Him. Then in conclusion, that the whole may be made holy, "the feet also are annointed and blessed. They are to feel, "even in the event of possible recovery, a repugnance to "touching this earthly, hard, impenetrable soil. A wonderful "nimbleness is to be imparted to them, by which they spurn "from under them the clod of earth which hitherto attracted "them. And so through a brilliant circle of equally holy acts, "the beauty of which we have only briefly hinted at, the cradle "and the grave, however far asunder they may chance to be, "are bound in one continuous circle.

"But all these spiritual wonders spring not, like other fruits, "from the natural soil where they can neither be sown, nor "planted, nor cherished. We must supplicate for them from

"another region, a thing which cannot be done by all persons, "nor at all times. Here we meet the highest of these symbols, "derived from pious tradition. We are told that one man can "be more favoured, blessed, and sanctified from above than "another. But that this may not appear as a natural gift, this "great boon, bound up with a heavy duty, must be commu-"nicated to others by one authorized person; and the greatest "good that a man can attain, without his having to obtain it "by his own wrestling or grasping, must be preserved and "perpetuated on earth by spiritual heirship. In the very "ordination of the priest, is comprehended all that is necessary "for the effectual solemnizing of those holy acts, by which the "multitude receive grace, without any other activity being "needful on their part, than that of faith and implicit "confidence. And thus the priest steps forth in the line of his "predecessors and successors, in the circle of those anointed "with him, representing the highest source of blessings, so much "the more gloriously, as it is not he, the priest whom we "reverence, but his office; it is not his nod to which we bow "the knee, but the blessing which he imparts, and which seems "the more holy, and to come the more immediately from "heaven, because the earthly instrument cannot at all weaken "or invalidate it by its own sinful, nay, wicked nature.

"How is this truly spiritual connexion shattered to pieces in "Protestantism, by part of the above-mentioned symbols being "declared apocryphal, and only a few canonical! And how, "by their indifference to one of these, will they prepare us for "the high dignity of the others?"[8]

8. It will be readily admitted that the sanctification of man's whole life from his cradle to the grave, and the variety of ways in which outward worship is interlaced with the religious emotions of the heart, must exercise a powerful influence on the moral life. The believer is brought into quite a different atmosphere, and cannot but feel that his conversation is not on

8 The Auto-Biography of Goethe, Bohn's Transl. vol. I: p. 245-248.

earth, but in heaven, where Christ sits at the Father's right hand. Again, the consciousness of belonging to the one great and holy family of God, which in every place on earth invokes the holy name of Jesus, offers a holy sacrifice, receives holy sacraments, and offers prayers for one another, cannot fail to move and melt the most icy heart. Even apart from the countless graces given by the sacraments to raise the courage of the struggling, to comfort and refresh the sorrowful, to arm the sick with patience, this unity and community of worship and life alone is calculated to inspire Catholics with ever fresh enthusiasm. Indeed, the early Fathers frequently mention that the Christians were wont to bless and sanctify everything,—meat and drink, labours and repose, exits and entrances—by the sign of the Cross. The perfume of the sanctuary and altar was carried away by them, and it penetrated into daily life. The whole life was consecrated to the Redeemer, and became, as it were, a continued divine service.

The Christian life, then, was to be a holy life. In the holy conversation of her children the sanctity of the Church would display and reflect itself in an especial manner. The tree would make itself known by its fruits. The means of grace were both a means, an incentive, and an obligation to practise holiness; nor was it possible that they should remain unproductive. Our Lord requires His disciples to be perfect as their heavenly Father is perfect. The Epistles are full of admonitions to the "saints" to live in a manner worthy of their calling. They should now give their members to serve justice unto sanctification (Rom. VI. 19), and offer their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and well-pleasing to God. (Rom. XII. 1. 2). They should now conduct themselves as obedient children, no more conformed to the former desires of ignorance, but according to Him who is holy, who hath called them to be holy in their conversation: "For it is written: You shall be holy, because I am holy." (I Pet. I. 14-16). Christ hath chosen us that we may be holy and unspotted before Him in charity. (Ephes. I. 4).

9. The Fathers enjoined the same duties on the faithful, and they have left it on record that their appeals for holiness of life were in great measure responded to. Here we need only repeat what has been already said on the wonderful effects wrought by Christianity. The Apologists held up before the heathen glowing descriptions of the virtues practised by Christians. Here we will give only a few samples, trusting thereby to stimulate the appetite for more.[9] Tatian crowds a great deal into a small space. "Ambition is not my friend; "riches I seek not, preferment I care not for, luxury I detest; "I will not dive into the sea to satisfy insatiable greed. I fight "not for laurel wreaths of victory. From vain glory I am free. "Death I despise, and I am above all ailments. No trouble is "gnawing at my spirit. If I am a slave, I endure slavery; if I "am a free man, I do not brag about my high birth." Anyone, says Minutius Felix, "who compares us Christians with "you (heathen), will find us very much better than you, "although some of us may be found wanting. You, for "instance, forbid adultery and commit it; you punish criminal "deeds; with us it is a sin so much as to think of anything "criminal. You dread those cognizant of your evil deeds; we "dread nothing but conscience, without which we cannot be "accomplices. Lastly, from your ranks the state prisons are "filled. There is no Christian here unless he be an apostate, "or imprisoned for the sake of his religion." "We consider it "far nobler to despise earthly treasures than to possess them. "Our first desire is to be guiltless; we pray for perseverance; we "had rather be virtuous than extravagant. That we feel and "suffer bodily infirmities is not a punishment, rather it burdens "us; for power is made perfect in infirmity, and misfortune is "often a school for virtue." "What a beautiful sight it is when "a Christian wrestles with pain, and holds his own against "menaces, and death sentences, and the rack; when he stands

9 See *Christian Apology*. vol. ii. chap. ix. Ignat., *Ad Ephes*, c. 14. Iren. ii. 23-4. Tertull., *Ad Ux.* ii. 8. Orig., *De incarn*. c. 31. 48, 51.

"calm and unconcerned, and all the excitement and bustle "attendant on his execution; when he despises and ridicules "fear of the executioner; when he sets greater store by his "liberty than on kings and princes, and yields to God alone to "whom he belongs; when in the hour of his triumph and "victory he playfully laughs at the judge who sentenced him "to death.[10]

The Christian poets, likewise, have borne witness to the holiness of the Church, as may be seen from the poems of Prudentius, or the hymns in the Liturgy or office. Among the Syrian poems translated by Bickell is one on the "Sanctity "of the Church," which beautifully describes its different phases.[11] Addressing God, it says: "Everywhere thou seest "monasteries, peopled with the perfect. There are hermits "living in caves, and the desert teems with holy penitents. "There are monks on the mountains, and sainted heroes on "islands. Houses resound with thy praises, O Lord! and "a hymn ascends to thee from the fields. Cities obey thy "teaching, and princes stand in fear of thy judgments. Nay, "dread of thy wrath hath seized sinners and made them chaste. "The Persian believes thy doctrine, and the Assyrian has "bowed down before thy envoys. Lo! Thomas teaches in "India, and Peter preaches to the Romans. Queens love thee, "and kings are subject to thy cross. Thy most sacred flesh "and blood gives life to thy bride, the Church. Even infants "sing thy hymns, and women thy psalms. The whole world "keeps festivals in thy honour, to appease thee."

This, surely, furnishes proof for the holiness of the Church. Or is it, perhaps, possible to separate the holiness of the faithful from that of the Church? The Fathers did not think so, and they raised their voice in protest when heretics resorted to this strategy. The Church, they say, is the fount whence sanctity flows to the faithful; heresy, by attacking the Church's

10 *Orat. adv. Graec.* c. 11. M. Felix, *Octav.* c. 35-37.

11 *Ausgewählte Schriften der Syrischen Kirchenväter.* Kempten, 1874, p. 419.

unity, also sets the knife to her sanctity. Heresy is responsible for the increase of wickedness among Christians, and is hastening on the end of the world.[12] Hence the saintly life led by the early Christians is a proof of the sanctity of the Catholic Church. He who is not in her has no part in the Holy Spirit, is not suckled at his mother's breasts unto life; and draws not from the fountain which streams forth from the body of Christ. He drinks impure water from muddy cisterns, and perishes.[13]

10. Another aspect of Christian life will lead us to the same conclusion. Viewed from its outward and practical side, the Christian religion is a great renunciation of the world and its pleasures. Prayer, fasting and almsdeeds, done for love of God and our neighbour, are the works by which they try to gain a treasure in heaven, and merit eternal life. All classes of society embrace a life of voluntary poverty. Rich lords and ladies, youths and maidens give their fortunes to the poor and follow Jesus. Those who had previously feasted sumptuously, are content with a morsel of bread and a cup of water. They who had formerly dwelt in palaces, and were clothed in purple and fine linen, choose a solitary cell or a deserted cabin for their abode; and a hair-shirt for their vesture. They who had heretofore been surrounded by a numerous retinue of servants, ready to do their bidding at every beck and call, are now the servants of the poor, the sick, the prisoners and strangers. For Jesus Himself came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. And with poverty they joined self-denial and virginal chastity. The Fathers never tire of pointing to this noble fruit of the Church's sanctity. The lily of purity has nowhere found genial soil, light and heat but in Christianity; and now it flourishes only in the Catholic Church. Christian perfection, which attains its zenith in the evangelical counsels, was ever considered the most beautiful proof for the Church's holiness. But the evangelical counsels exist in the Catholic Church alone;

12 Cypr., *De Unit.* c. 16.
13 Iren., iii. 24, 1.

and in her, according to the example set by our Lord and the Apostles, they have held sway from the beginning.

11. If it be admitted, and one can hardly see how it can be disputed, that Christianity; at least since the middle of the second century, assumed the shape of the Catholic Church, the many sainted Christians of antiquity are so many witnesses to the sanctity of the Catholic Church. Similar sanctity in the sects we shall seek in vain, even when they so far agree with the Catholic Church as to place their ideal of Christian perfection in renouncing riches and pleasures. What man in his senses would compare Cerinthus, Marcion, Montanus, Arius, Nestorius, and such like, with Christian saints and martyrs like Ignatius, Justin, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine? What has been in past times, is still in the present. The line of saints continues, though not always in an ascending scale.

S. Augustine, in his retractations,[14] says that the Scripture text he had used in his work against the Donatists on baptism, to wit, that the Church has neither spot nor wrinkles (Ephes. v. 27), must not be understood to mean that the Church is actually so free, but that she is destined to be so when she shall appear in glory. For, in view of some follies and weaknesses of her members she has still good reason to say daily: Forgive us our trespasses. Thus he was not blind to the fact that there was a reverse of the medal in the life of the early Christians, as is clear, for the rest, from the history of penitential discipline. The Fathers are much less reticent on the darker side of the Church * than the Apologists. Take, for instance, the writings of S. Chrysostom. Still we must bear in mind that these homilies are of an exhortatory and oratorical character, and that he, and

14 *Retr.* ii. 18. *De Bapt.* i. 17; iii. 18; iv. 3. 4.

* This expression, though perfectly clear in the author, is often an occasion of serious misunderstanding and error, especially to Non-Catholics. The word Church may be used in two senses. It may mean her institutions, her Apostolate and Ministry, her doctrines and means of grace. These are all divine and therefore absolutely perfect and holy. But the word Church may also be taken to signify the vast assemblage of her members who are saints and sinners mingled together. In this sense one may speak of the darker side of the Church. Tr.

other Fathers, in their writings, judge Christian life by a very high standard. Nevertheless it is undeniable that comparatively early, as soon as the fury of persecution had somewhat abated, and Christians increased in numbers, a certain laxity had found its way among many of the faithful, especially among the rich. Still more was this the case when Christianity was declared to be the State-religion, and many worldly advantages were attached to it.

12. But wherever there are shadows, there is light. The line of great and holy men, who laboured zealously for the sanctification of their fellow-men, never failed. Times out of number men and women vowed their fortunes to God, and spent their lives in ministering to the poor. It was slow work, indeed, to bring about the moral conversion of the corrupt Roman world and of semi-civilized peoples But whence would have come the moral force to redress wrongs, to heal wounds, to sow and to develop a new life, if the Catholic Church had not taken the task in hand, and solved it amidst the struggle of human passion. What sacrifices of toil and labour, of power and fortune, of life and blood, were needed to dispel the darkness of error, to break the bonds of sin, to induce the world to worship God in spirit and truth, and to inflame it with zeal for moral ideas and for holiness!

Later on, too, there may have been many reverses, and many abuses. Nay, if at times it seemed as though God had abandoned His Church, and Christ His bride, it will always be found that much that was good and holy existed by the side of stalking vice. Even in the centuries most fraught with danger, there were holy men in all lands, who raised their voice in warning and denunciation. The old Protestant view as if there had been nothing but darkness in the middle ages, is now generally abandoned. It is admitted that even then piety and virtue were in the ascendant, and that Christian ideas had penetrated all strata of society, from the highest to the lowest. The monuments of art, such as prints and copperplates of the

14th and 15th centuries, testify to the deep religious sense that animated the people, especially the Teutonic race. So again the foundation of the two great mendicant orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans, are in themselves a living proof for the same fact. The monks of the West, in Montalembert's spirited picture, the pioneers of civilization, afford sufficient materials for studying the services rendered by Holy Church, in that "degenerate" age, towards raising the material status and moral tone of the nations.

13. The same, too, is true of the sixteenth century. The Church could not possibly have withstood the powerful assaults made upon her, nor have survived the great apostacy, had she been in reality so corrupt as she was painted, too often, indeed, by men who are not ranked with the saints, and who did not leave her out of zeal for sanctity! Was it a sincerely conscientious scruple that made Henry VIII. leave the Catholic Church and become a cruel tyrant both to his unlawfully wedded wives and to his subjects? Did England grow in Christian charity, since the "Virgin Queen" became the head of the Anglican Church? Anyone who reads and compares history of those days with preceding times, may well think twice before throwing stones at the Middle Ages. The many complaints made by the German Reformers on the unbridled licentiousness that prevailed everywhere, at least prove that the "preaching of the Gospel" had not been productive of a great increase in holiness.[15] The emphasis laid on grace to the exclusion of all else, and the rejection of every meritorious work, could not but lead to extravagances. If man's works are all evil, it is easy to infer that all things are lawful. "Antinomism," says Pfleiderer, "is harmless when joined to "the exalted and pure notions of religion and spirituality, "that filled Paul and kindred spirits; but for the vast majority of a Christian communion it is fraught with the "greatest dangers. Such was the experience of the ancient Church, and the Lutheran Church could also, on "this head, a pretty tale unfold."*

15 See Janssen, *Geschichte*, etc. ii. 345.

* Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 210.

The history of the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, sanctioned by the Reformers, casts a lurid light on many of the princes whose hearts heaved with anxiety for the spread of the Gospel. Philip, whose court preacher, Melander, also had several wives, was thinking, in sober earnestness, of introducing bigamy into his territory.[16] I am not going to deny that grave abuses had crept into the Catholic Church in that age; but those, who have so many earthen vessels in their own house, have no right to reproach the Church because all hers are not of pure gold.

Anyone reading Luther's contemptuous expressions in regard to his opponents, as well as to sacred persons and things, will hardly feel disposed to excuse them in a "godly man," on the mere plea that the "age was rough." Kepler, who meant to be an upright Lutheran, without swearing by Luther, says: "What shall I say of Luther? He is a peculiar man. The "motives that guide and prevail upon wise men, could never "induce him to be false to truth. In this he was the wisest "among men. But what shall I say of his slanderous pro-"clivities and his obscenity? Are these compatible with a wise "man? . . . . As long as passion remains within the "precincts of duty and follows reason, it is under God's "guidance; but where that is not the case, great minds will "often expose to view great vices as well as great virtues."[17]

14. The choicest flower of Christian holiness, the religious life of men and women consecrated to God, the Reformers ruthlessly plucked up by the roots, instead of pruning it of accidental excrescences, and restoring it to its original perfection. Nay more, by their doctrine of original sin and justification, they rendered all sanctity problematical. Human nature, even from the cradle, they regarded as radically bad. Good works they branded as useless, if not positively detrimental to eternal life. And thus they laid the axe to the root of the tree of sanctity planted by the Apostles. "What early

16 Keller, *Reformation*, p. 456. See *Histor. Polit. Blätter*, 1888, 101, 5: p. 321.
17 *Opera*, edit. Frisch, v. 480. See Schuster, *Johann Kepler*. Graz 1888, p. 156.

"Protestant theologians, both Lutheran and Reformed, relate "of the destructive effects of the doctrine of justification "unfolded by the Reformation, is now receiving confirmation "in America, where the doctrine is still preached from many a "pulpit. The works of American theologians contain many "noteworthy admissions to this effect."[18] When W. Menzel said that with the Reformation a new sort of barbarism inundated the Protestant courts and universities, and that only darkness and coarse brutality now emanated from institutions that were wont to send forth light and humanism, his judgment was declared to be warped. When Janssen, in proof thereof, collated the sources of information, his work was censured as a wilfully bungling performance. But nowadays there is a growing consensus of opinion that a universal decline was the immediate result of the Reformation (Droysen, Roscher, Meitzen and others). No doubt there were evils and abuses; otherwise, the Reformation would be quite inexplicable. But this Reformation, instead of redressing wrongs, began by undermining faith and authority, which are the very foundations and sources of the sanctity of the Church.

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, in the Council of Trent, strove to reform the abuses, and clearly set forth and defined the groundwork of holiness. And the following age furnished the proof that this reform in head and members had opened anew the sources of supernatural life. Men may smile and ridicule her hierarchy and gorgeous ceremonial, but these are real incentives to Christian life. "The Catholic Church," says an unbiassed observer, "both in the mutual intercourse of the "members with one another and with God, is so admirable, "great, and free, that her adherents need only smile at the "twofold taunt of their adversaries, namely, that they display "an almost pantheistic enthusiasm for the Church, and, more-"over, sacrifice their intellectual independence. For besides

18 Döllinger, *Kirche*, p: 341. Röhm, *Confessionelle Lehrgegensäse*, II. 92. Hoboff, *Die Revolution seit dem 16. Jahrhund*, etc. Freiburg 1887.

"an illustrious hierarchy, before whom even kings tremble, "they (Catholics) can point to the monk's contempt of the "world; and monasticism finds itself at home, not in Protes- "tantism, but only in the more universal bosom of the Catholic "Church."[19]

16. Who, then, would blame a Catholic if he speaks with a certain pride of the Church's holiness? The Church is always holy, though many of her members have been, and are still, unholy. The words used by Apologists are not all rhetoric: "The Church as instituted by Christ has never erred; never "became wicked, never lost her strength; for that strength is "ever there, even though it be not always equally conspicuous."[20] Unless the Church had in her the indestructible force of truth and sanctity which may be somewhat obscured, but never suppressed, by the ungodliness of individual members or even pastors, she could never have ridden safely above wild squalls and storms, nor emerged from all her struggles triumphant.* Both Church and Christianity would have disappeared from the face of the world. The sects of the Middle Ages were as impotent as ancient heretics to save either; being destitute of divine authority and power, they have no consistency, and are swept away by other sects in turn. The Augsburg Confession believes in one, holy Church, existing and enduring for all time. This, surely, must mean that the Church, before the Reformation, was the one holy Church. Should she have ceased for one moment to be this?

17. Bellarmine, in rejecting all definitions of the Church which base membership on merely internal conditions, and thus render the Church invisible,[21] does not mean to surrender the Church's note of sanctity, but only to give greater prominence to the outward marks of membership. "We believe that all

19 Teichmüller, *Religionsphilosophie*, p. 424.

20 Möhler, p. 352. Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 222. *Kirche*, p. xxiv.

21 ii. 3, 2.

* Even the worst epochs of the Church seem to be distinguished by the great number of saints. Think of the 16th century! Tr.

"virtues are to be found in the Church: faith, hope, charity, "and the rest. But to belong in any way to the true Church, "spoken of in Scripture, no inward virtue whatever but only "external profession of faith and communion of sacraments are "necessary." In order, however, to make it quite clear that he does not make the Church consist merely of externals, he straightway uses S. Augustine's simile of the living body, of the body and soul of the Church.

18. Figures and statistics, it need hardly be said, are not available in this sphere of moral and especially supernatural virtue; for the simple reason that many good actions, nay the very best, are mostly hidden from view. The works of Christian charity in tending the sick and the poor may, indeed, be computed, in so far as they are made public. But the motives and circumstances which inspire them and constitute their chief value, remain hidden. Still, even apart from the motives, and considering only the deeds of charity, the Catholic Church has nothing to fear from a comparison. Here, again, it is the religious orders which, above all, by their spirit of self-sacrifice, furnish the highest proof of charity to one's neighbour. As this subject is one of frequent discussion in our own days, it may be well to quote the words of two Protestant authorities. President von Gerlach thus writes: "Day by day we see how slight, in comparison with the "Catholic Church, is the influence wielded by the Evangelical "Church, in enlightening and sanctifying the people in the "mass and the majority of its members. The reason is not "far to seek." Privy Councillor Eilers says: "I have studied "the connection subsisting between the Christian life of a "Catholic people, and the usages and institutions of the Catholic "Church, and I must reluctantly confess that there is more "Christianity in the present Catholic Church than in the "present Evangelical Church.[22] I consider it a well-established "fact that the Evangelical clergy, in self-sacrificing parochial

22 Gerlach, *Actenstücke* etc. Berlin 1856, iii, 423. Eilers, *Meine Wanderungen durchs Leben.* Leipzig 1857, ii. 266. See Döllinger, *Kirche*, p. 489.

"work, are generally far behind the Catholic."

19. With crime, however, the case would seem to be different, and statistics might claim their full rights, because the secrecy of crime rests on a wholly different basis. But any one, who has studied statistical tables knows that figures, though not defective, may yet be deceptive. What assurance have we that any given statistics are exhaustive? or again, that the grouping is correct, or that it justifies more than quite general conclusions, or that many other factors have not to be taken into account, such as external circumstances of country, climate, political and social conditions, and such like? Criminal statistics, therefore, scarcely enable us to go half way in forming a correct estimate of the influences of the Church on morality. The attempt to show from these tables that certain and especially smaller districts have a higher standard of morality, is but a sham manœuvre, prompted by sectarian motives, against which statisticians themselves are warning us. If, on the strength of criminal statistics, one were to maintain that crimes must not be laid to the charge of free will, but are in general dependent on essentially permanent causes, would these manipulators of figures allow that every murderer is a madman?

20. As a further proof of the Church's sanctity, miracles, which have been worked continuously in the Church, are, as a rule, appealed to. This proof holds good if we consider the main cause and object of miracles. On the one hand, they reveal the working of the Holy Ghost ever present in the Church; on the other, they tend to overthrow the empire of Satan. God's creatures are snatched from the power of the devil; and God's kingdom is promoted and glorified by corporal and spiritual aids. This subject has been already treated,[23] so we need here only to draw out the consequences. Critics may decry the "Romish craving for miracles;"[24] but it is

23 See *Christian Apology*, vol. ii. chap. ix. Also Bellarmine ii. 4, 14. Tournely, p. 69, 72.

24 Tschakert, p. 108.

impossible to simply bury in universal doubt all that the Fathers have attested as eyewitnesses. Nor can all the miraculous occurrences of ancient and modern times be set aside off-hand as so much fraud and deception. After all, prayer is an element in every religion. But prayer supposes belief in its power and efficacy. Therefore, unless miracles are said to be impossible, there may be wonderful answers to prayers. The same power of the Lord that manifests itself in prayer, is also at work in miracles, which are almost always accompanied by prayer, and accomplished with prayer and fasting. Whatever Protestants may think of the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, they cannot deny that the divine power of Jesus Christ may work a miracle in answer to prayers.*

S. Irenæus, while warning against false miracles, bears witness to the existence of miracles worked by prayer in his own time. He says: "Moreover, those also will be thus confuted who "belong to Simon and Carpocrates, and if there be any others "who are said to perform miracles—who do not perform what "they do either through the power of God, or in connection "with the truth, nor for the well-being of men, but for the sake "of destroying and misleading mankind, by means of magical "deceptions, and with universal deceit, thus entailing greater "harm than good on those who believe them, with respect "to the point on which they lead them astray." "For they "can neither give sight to the blind, nor hearing to the deaf, "nor cast out devils, except such as they themselves have sent "into others; if, indeed, they can do as much as this. Nor "can they cure the weak, or the lame, or the paralytic . . .

* The promises of Christ are most explicit both as to the continuity of miracles (Mark xvi. 18), and the universal efficacy of Christian prayer (Matth. vii. 7, 11; xviii. 19; xxi. 22. John xiv.-xvi. I John iii.-v). It is to be noticed, moreover, that the two are closely connected. Belief in the continuity of miracles is the very life and strength of the spirit of prayer, as the absence of that belief is the death of prayer. Yet strange to say, whenever the spirit of prayer awakens with new vigour among the Catholic people, and attains to its highest expression in public pilgrimages, the Protestant world is aroused to a very different manifestation of spirit! An earnest mind will here find matter for reflection. Tr.

"And so far are they from being able to raise the dead, as "the Lord raised them, and the Apostles did by means of "prayer, *and as has been frequently done in the brotherhood* "on account of some necessity—the entire Church in that "particular locality entreating with much fasting and prayer, the "spirit of the dead man has returned, and he has been bestowed "in answer to the prayers of the saints."[25] Again, he continues: "Wherefore, also, those who are in truth His disciples, receiving "grace from Him, do in His name perform (miracles), so as "to promote the welfare of other men, according to the gift "which each one has received from Him. For some do certainly "and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been "cleansed from evil spirits, frequently both believe and join "themselves to the Church. Others have foreknowledge of "things to come: they see visions, and utter prophetic expres- "sions. Others still, heal the sick by laying their hands upon "them, and they are made whole. Yea, moreover, as I have "said, the dead even have been raised up, and remained among "us for many years. And what shall I more say? It is not "possible to name the number of the gifts which the Church, "[scattered] throughout the whole world, has received from "God, in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under "Pontius Pilate, and which she exerts day by day for the "benefit of the Gentiles, neither practising deception upon any, "nor taking any reward from them. For as she has received "freely from God, freely also does she minister."[26]

Carlstadt, says Luther, is doing "his work without a vocation, "or, if he were acting from an inward call of God," he would have to "prove it by miracles." "For God changes not the "old order for a new one, unless he works (and accompanies "the change with) great signs. Hence no one is to be believed "when he appeals to his own spirit and inmost feelings, and "outwardly raves against God's common order."[27] But to the

25 *Adv. Haer.* ii. 31, 2. 3; 32, 3. 4. (Clarke's Tr.)
26 *Ibid.* v. 6. 1. Cf. ii. 23. 4; iii. 26, 9.
27 Janssen, ii. 378.

old order, according to universal belief, belonged miracles, as proof of the Spirit of God.

21. The aim and end of the Church is man's sanctification. This end is attained more or less proximately, according to the measure in which individuals co-operate with grace. The Church on earth is a Church militant; but sanctity can never wholly fail in her. Eternal life must be begun here in faith and charity, if it is to be continued in the world beyond; the seed of resurrection must be planted in the mortal body, if it is to rise again in glory. Union with the God-Man receives its complement in heaven. Therein lies the Christian's hope in death; on this rests the faith that the members of the body of Christ, that have found their true home, are spiritually united with those still sojourning on their pilgrimage. It is a great communion of saints. The faithful, incorporated in the body of Christ have community of mind and heart with God and His angels, and with the saints who see God's face. And in God the saints see all who are still pilgrims in this vale of tears. They see their needs and dangers; they hear their sighs and prayers; and they supplicate with Christ for grace and mercy, so that the Church triumphant may grow in numbers, and that God's praises may be more loudly proclaimed.

The eight Beatitudes, which are the pivot on which the office for All Saints turns, show in a most striking manner the intimate connection between the Church militant and the Church triumphant. For they are as applicable to the true members of God's kingdom on earth as to the saints in heaven. The Church both in heaven and on earth is one and the same, but the sorroundings are different. "Here, says S. Augustine, "the Church is imperfect, as it includes the wicked; but the "future Church contains none such. Now it is mortal, being "composed of mortal men; but then it will be immortal, as "none in her will die. But there are not two Churches any "more than there are two Christs; for having died once, He "dieth now no more."[28] All who cleave to God, and carry the

28 *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 9, 16; 20, 20.

charity of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, form with God one community. They are the city of God, having the same living sacrifice and its living temple. That portion of mortal men which will one day be joined to the immortal angels, is now partly on its earthly pilgrimage, and partly resting in the mysterious abodes of souls.[29]

The Roman Catechism speaks thus of the connection between the two parts of the Church: "The Church, then, consists "principally of two parts, the one called the Church triumphant, "the other the Church militant. The Church triumphant is "that most glorious and happy assemblage of blessed spirits, "and of those who triumphed over the world, the flesh, and the "devil, and who, free and secure from the troubles of this life, "enjoy everlasting bliss. But the Church militant is the society "of all the faithful still living on earth, and is called militant "becauses it wages perpetual war with those implacable "enemies, the world, the flesh and the devil. We are not, "however, hence to infer that there are two Churches; but "there are, as we have already said, two constituent parts of "the same Church, one of which has gone before, and is now in "the possession of its heavenly country; the other following "every day, until at length, united with our Saviour, it repose "in endless felicity."[30]

23.† It will, perhaps, conduce to a clearer understanding of the foregoing chapter, if we add one or two remarks in explanation of the term "holiness."

Whatever, then, be the true etymology of the word "holy"—*sanctus*, *sacer*, ἅγιος, ὅσιος, kodesh—certain it is that the idea which underlies the word is, in its primary import, applied exclusively to God. Nothing else is holy but by reason of some special connection and contact with Him. Thus, the revealed word of God, and the charismata, or supernatural gifts of power and grace, are holy by the very character of their

29 Aug. *De Civ. Dei.* xii. 19.
30 *Cat. Rom.* i. 10, 5.

origin; other things, that once were not considered holy, being specially dedicated and consecrated to the divine honour and service, are, by that destination and purpose rendered holy. Hence all holiness in the creature redounds to the holiness of God; and if we would seek the true meaning of the term, we must find its interpretation in Him.

Holiness is ascribed to God in a twofold sense. It may denote either a moral attribute or, what Theologians call a physical attribute. We shall begin with the latter. The Divine Being is so pure and perfect, so exalted and beautiful, so majestic and unapproachable that everything else is by comparison empty, vile, impure, contemptible. To express this wide and awful contrast we call God a Sacred Being. All else is profane. But when creatures, profane in themselves, are touched by the hand of God, or overshadowed by His Divine presence, or assumed to a special union with Him, or made the instruments of His sanctifying word and grace, or set apart for His worship and service, they too become holy, in a physical and generic sense. We thus account holy the prophets and messengers of God, bishops and priests, the burning bush, the ark, the temple, Mary, the Virgin-Mother of our Lord, and, above all, the most sacred humanity of Jesus Christ. They are holy by an overflow, as it were, of the holiness of God.

But God is holy with a moral holiness also. For, as a personal Being, He is, in mind and will, absolutely just and righteous. He cannot err; He cannot sin. This complete and perfect truthfulness, this absolute moral goodness, is holiness. Its roots are found in the physical attributes of God. Owing to His infinitely perfect knowledge, and supreme unwavering love of what is right and just, God is found to be, in the moral sense of the words, *Sanctus Sanctorum*. Now creatures that are intelligent and free may be more or less conformed to the mind and will of God; and according to the measure of their conformity they are more or less holy in the specific and moral sense of the word.

This conformity may be a merely natural excellence, arising from a natural knowledge of the truth and a natural love of the good. However, it would not be called holiness unless it had been cultivated, so to speak, under the eye of God, and with a direct purpose of obeying Him, and of discharging a duty towards Him as the Prescriber of moral conduct, the Lawgiver and Judge over all creatures. Moreover, even on this supposition, the holiness would be nothing more than mere natural holiness.

We say 'mere natural holiness,' because there is a form of holiness not natural, but supernatural—a conformity with the mind and will of God, that is based upon a participation in the direct and secret knowledge of God by means of revelation and the infused gift of faith, and a participation in God's perfect love by means of sanctifying grace and the infused virtue of supernatural charity. By these gifts the soul of man is raised above its natural sphere and condition, it is set in an exalted state of resemblance to God in which it lives a life truly divine, and is graced with the priceless dignity of divine sonship. It is "*born* "again" of God. Such supernatural moral goodness, quite unattainable by purely human effort, and conveyed by an altogether free gift of God, is emphatically and strictly called holiness. To distinguish it from physical holiness, this latter is more properly termed sacredness.

Since the root and basis of holiness in the creature must be referred to sanctifying grace, without a clear idea of grace our knowledge of holiness will be vague and misty; yet, outside the Catholic Church, the true import of grace is almost entirely unknown. Now it is precisely this grace, with its unlimited capacity of increase, that is bestowed and nourished through the ministry of the Church: her hierarchy and doctrine, her sacraments and liturgy, directly tend to the one purpose of restoring and increasing in the souls of men the great and precious gift of God by which they are made partakers of the divine nature and are moulded in the divine image—that

wondrous gift once bestowed on our first parents, and by them lost, but won back by the passion and death of God's Consubstantial Son, the Word made flesh.

It is now, we trust, quite plain, that the Church must be considered holy with a twofold holiness. She is *sacred* in her divine origin; in her sacraments and hierarchy, which are the organs of the Holy Ghost; in her preaching, as the mouthpiece of God, the deep things of the Spirit which have been revealed to her; in her closeness to the indwelling God, who ever guides and assists her. She is *holy* in the supernatural life of her children, in the outpouring of grace, in the divinely communicated gifts of faith and hope and charity, in the precious fruits of heavenly virtue. She is the house and temple of God; her sons are the sons of the Most High.

Just as the soul of man is, in itself, invisible, so, of course, the Church's attribute of holiness is, in its essence, an invisible attribute; yet, for all that, her holiness is not without visible tokens of its inward presence. *Incessu patuit Dea.* Like our Lord on the mount, the Church has her transfiguration. The brightness of her beauty shines through the veil, and reveals itself in the wonderful list of her saints, and in her undoubted influence upon the moral regeneration of the world. After all, however, her one great mark of holiness—a mark altogether peculiar to herself—may be found in her ministry of reconciliation, her Sacrament of Penance, her attitude towards sinners and unquestionable influence over them. To those in darkness, she brings light; to the erring, rest; to the despairing, hope and peace. Now it is precisely this Sacrament of Penance and reconciliation that false Churches first of all cast away.

CHAPTER XI.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

1.* *Grace* and *Truth* are the two great gifts which the incarnate Son of God brought down from heaven to fallen man. "And the Word [Truth] was made flesh and dwelt among us ". . . . full of grace and truth. . . . . And of His "fulness we have all received, and grace for grace." John. I. 14. 16). He wished to be to all the way, the truth, and the life. (John XIV. 6). For this He was born, and for this He came into the world, that He might give testimony to the truth. Everyone that is of the truth, heareth His voice. (John XVIII. 37). Jesus accomplished the work that the Father gave Him to do. He is in the faithful, and the Father is in Him, that all may be made one; "and that the world may know "that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast "also loved me." (John XVII. 23).

The vital question which now arises, and which intimately concerns every man in this world is, how is Christ's truth and grace to reach the individual soul? How is faith, the beginning and root of the new life of grace, to be acquired and retained by each believer? This question has been already answered in the preceding chapters. Christ has established a Church on earth, a true and perfect society with all its essential organic elements, a veritable kingdom of truth and grace. The law of truth and grace is its vital principle. But all law in a society springs from authority which for this reason is called the soul

of society. If, then, the premisses are true, there can be no doubt that a living and divinely constituted authority is the immediate source from which divine truth and grace flow upon each individual soul. It is, therefore, by the principle of authority, that is, by tradition, that believers are made. Nevertheless, as the question is a fundamental one, we deem it necessary to examine it in a special chapter, and to thoroughly sift the evidence from Scripture and the records of antiquity.

I. IN THE TIME OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

2.* It is self-evident that the first thing to be considered in this question, is Christ's own example and method of teaching, and the measures He took for assuring the continuance of the teaching He had begun. He Himself was the first to commence the great edifice He intended to rear. He, the Master-builder, hewed and shaped the first stones, and placed them one by one upon the chief corner-stone; and we may naturally presume that the edifice was to be built in accordance with His plan. His first care was to make good His authority over those whom He intended to teach. That He was sent by God, nay, that He is God Himself, must be the first article of their creed. This was the great central point towards which His doctrine and miracles converged. By miracles He gained authority, and by authority faith, says Tertullian. This is plainly written on the face of the Gospels. His next step was to select from the believers twelve men, to be His special friends and pupils, and to take part in His own missionary labours. They were to be at once His disciples, and teachers under Him. For this purpose He endowed them with credentials like His own, namely, the gift of miracles. These twelve He called Apostles, that is to say, men *sent* by Him—Christ's messengers. To them He imparted the mysteries of the kingdom of God. They were to continue His work. What He had preached within the narrow boundaries of Palestine they were to preach to all nations. What He had taught them confiden-

tially and in secret, they were to preach from the house-tops; for there is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed. To ensure their preaching the Gospel, they received authority and power from above: Authority from Christ, power and ability from the Holy Ghost. Thus, not only their calling, duty, or office, but the very mode and manner of carrying it out, was clearly fixed. As Jesus had taught them by His personal authority and living voice, so were they to teach others by the personal authority they had received from Him, and by their infallible living voice. As He was sent by the Father, so were they sent by Him, to be the organs of truth and grace to mankind. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to "the consummation of the world." (Matth. XXVIII. 18-20). If ever there was a plain institution and foundation, a clear charter, an evident expression of the last will and testament, it is here.

3. Jesus has left behind no writings, neither a *resumé* of His revelation, nor instructions for the use of the Apostles. The Gospel, the glad tidings, He preached by word of mouth. He "went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and "preaching the Gospel of the kingdom." (Matth. IV. 23). If all the phrases used in the Gospels, such as the Teaching, the Word, the Preaching, the good Tidings, the Commandments of Jesus, were put together; and if, moreover, a collection were made of the verbs used to designate the preaching of the Gospel (e.g. preaching, speaking, bearing witness, hearing, receiving, keeping, &c.), they would form a striking body of evidence as to the method Jesus adopted in teaching, and would at the same time furnish a telling picture of the Master, surrounded by disciples hanging on His every word, and of people listening with breathless attention. But there is not the faintest allusion to written teaching. Not, indeed, that Christ

was unaware of that method, or did not appreciate its importance for religious truth. For He knew the Scriptures; He appealed to what was written—to Moses and the Prophets; and He bade men search the Scriptures to learn what was there foretold about Christ.

This fact is so clear and patent, that it has only to be stated. Nor need we discuss in detail the question why Jesus did not originally choose writing as the medium for propagating His doctrine.[1] Neither the defective education of the disciples, nor the possibility of falsification, nor regard for heathen tribunals, nor the Jewish prohibition to teach except by word of mouth, nor again, the expectation that the Parousia was near at hand, nor yet chance, can be regarded as a sufficient reason. For the present it is enough to point out that in the lifetime of Jesus there was no need whatever for resorting to writing. His first and direct purpose was to gain access to the hearts and wills of His hearers, to awaken them to repentance, to gather round Him a living and vigorous community in which His word would be received and in due time bear fruit under His own fostering care.

Jesus, by His preaching, aimed at planting a new life, and by degrees leading His disciples to a higher knowledge and a new order of things. Truth and life were to go hand in hand, as they had always done, especially in ancient time. He taught as one having power, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees; He carried the hearts of His hearers along with Him, and filled His disciples with enthusiasm for His divine teaching and Messianic work. Then, again, a long time was needed to confirm and purify their faith, and to give them an insight into mysteries. And how could this end have been secured by writing? Our Lord's hearers, and the disciples, too, would have understood His writings as little as they understood the Old Testament. And yet our Lord saw Himself compelled to speak to the people only in parables, that they may have

1 See Aberle-Schanz, *Einleitung*, p. 7.

eyes and see not, and ears and hear not. If the disciples did not understand Jesus when He predicted His passion and resurrection, how could they have grasped a written exposition of His doctrine? They, indeed, declared that they understood Him in His farewell discourse (John xvi. 29), but their subsequent behaviour shows that this confession was the expression rather of love than of solid conviction. Their whole being had to be transformed and spiritualized, before they could be filled and penetrated by the living light of truth. Christianity is an inward, a personal, living relation and communication with God. Spirit and life are necessarily its foundation, and no writings can impart spirit and life, except to those who already possess both. "God gave no writings to the Apostles, "but in their stead He promised the grace of the Holy Spirit. "For He, said Jesus, will call to your mind all that I have "said to you."[2]

4. The deeper reason, then, for the method adopted by Jesus, lies in the great importance, and in the enthralling power of the living word,[3] and of example. "The living word, "possesses a secret, mysterious force; and passing from the "teacher's lips to the ears of the disciples, produces a more "powerful impression."[4] This power was so generally recognized, and had such far-reaching consequences in ancient times, that we shall search history in vain for any founder of religion who propagated his tenets by writing. The sacred books of the Hindus, Persians, Chinese, Egyptians and others are much more recent than the founders of their religions. Buddha left no writings. "We see here (in Buddhism) more "clearly than elsewhere that in a teacher's lifetime there is "felt to be no need to commit the events of his life to writing, "or to enshrine his teaching in a sacred canon. His presence "was all in all. Thought for the future, or of great renown

2 Chrys., *Homil. in Matth.* I. 2.
3 S. Thom., III. p. 42. a. 28
4 Hieron., *Ep. ad. Paul.* 53. 26

"in the future seldom crossed the minds of his hearers."[5] Confucius, Lao-tse and Zoroaster were not founders of religion, but reformers who collected, assorted and sifted what had been handed down. Mohammed, indeed, was most solicitous to have his revelations written down; but he ranked himself with the prophets who wrote down revelations at God's bidding. Of Moses, too, it may be truly said that he did not establish his religion, but found it already in existence. The covenant with Abraham was concluded, and the mark of the covenant already given. And Moses was commanded by God to make known and to write down the Law, that the Covenant might be renewed.

But Jesus was more than a prophet. He was the very God who had spoken through the prophets, and who now appeared in the flesh to complete the divine revelation in person. Who does not feel, that writing would have been a poor substitute for His living and burning word! How captivating His discourse! How overpowering the wisdom that revealed itself in the disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees! Who can imagine Him, so majestic and withal so simple, choosing to commit the words of life and truth to dead paper?

5. But, perhaps, it will be urged, with the Apostles the case was different. Would it not have been desirable that, after the death and resurrection of their Master, they should possess an exact summary of His revelation, and precise instructions to guide them in discharging the duties of their office? What an impression it would have made on their hearers, had they been able to produce the handwriting of God the Son Himself! Yet, not only did Christ not leave behind any written documents for the Apostles, but He expressly and repeatedly enjoined speaking and preaching as the means of propagating His doctrine. And so well did the Apostles understand and obey their Master's orders, that they considered the divine commission to preach by word of mouth, an indispensable condition for

5 M. Müller, *Vergleich. Religionswissenschaft*, 1874. p. 27.

Christian faith and life.[6] From the Acts of the Apostles, and from the Epistles a goodly collection might be made of phrases relative to the teaching office.

In the case of the Apostles, too, the external and the internal reasons already given against the use of writing, held good, perhaps in a still greater degree. The Apostles had to move in a hostile society composed of Jews and heathens. They had to be prepared for an outbreak of persecution at any moment. Then, again, for doing their work, speech was a far more effective instrument than writing. To found Churches and to convert unbelievers there is needed a stronger proof than a mere book, even if inspired, can offer; since this itself requires proof. But the Apostles had for their preaching a living proof, the proof and power of the Spirit, who guided their preaching, the proof of the gifts which were imparted by the Spirit to those who were baptized. Thus their word became spirit and life. For it was not they that spoke but the Spirit of God in them. The Apostles, it is true, frequently appealed to the Old Testament Scriptures, and drew out proofs from reason, but both these held a secondary place. They were for the purpose of supporting and explaining their preaching. Moreover. the Old Testament was recognized by the Jews, and its great age and antique wisdom could not fail to make an impression even on the heathen. But the proof always started from the new order, from Christ's life and work, which the Old Testament had foreshadowed. And it gained in strength when they were able to show that the Messias' person, character, and work had been foretold in the Old Testament. For thus they gave conclusive proof that the Spirit who spoke through the prophets was the very life and soul of Christianity. Reason, on the other hand, was called in to supply points of contact with faith, and to scatter prejudices that custom had ingrained in the life and belief of all classes. All this was but breaking the ground, and preparing the soil for receiving.

6 Rom. x. 14 seq. Ephes. iv. 7-24.

It belonged to the *motiva credibilitatis*, the preliminaries of faith, and preaching of the Gospel. But faith itself came from the Apostles, to whom was entrusted the seed of the divine word But it was a seed, with supernatural germinative power, a seed fructified by the Holy Spirit. Like a new leaven, the faith had to be set in a corrupt society in order to completely transform it. Such a process of fermentation, destined to lay hold of every fibre of the human heart, and to penetrate all the relations of life, could only be brought about by the living word of preachers who were endued with the Spirit of God. Life springs from life alone.

6 Still more necessary was a living tradition for divine worship, with its many details, its cycle of actions, and multitudinous grace-giving operations. In a remarkable passage S. Paul refers to what he had received from the Lord, and had delivered to the faithful concerning the Lord's Supper. (I Cor. XI. 23) This, we learn from him and the *Acts*, formed the centre of Christian worship When the Apostle commends the Corinthians (I Cor. XI 2) because they are in all things mindful of him, and hold fast to the traditions that he had handed down to them, he is putting in a plea for his regulations regarding the demeanour of women in the Church. His *mulier taceat in ecclesia* has passed into a winged word. In like manner, he adjures the Thessalonians to hold fast to the traditions they had received, whether by word of mouth or by his Epistle (II Thessal. II. 15) He beseeches the Romans to mark and to avoid "them "who cause dissensions and offences, contrary to the doctrine "which you have learned," (Rom. XVI. 17) because their conversation must be "worthy of the Gospel of Christ." (Phil. I. 27). "Rooted and built up in Him and confirmed in the "faith, as also you have learned, abounding in Him in thanks-"giving." (Col. II. 7).

7. In whatever way we explain Matth. VII. 26: "Give not that which is holy to dogs; neither cast ye your pearls before swine," it is clear, in any case, that circumspection in preaching

and instruction was enjoined on the "dispensers of the mysteries of God." It was their duty to guard the sacred mysteries, doctrinal and practical, from the profane. Hence it is but natural that the inner life of grace, and the pulsation of the Holy Spirit in the body of Christ, can nowhere be fully recognized and felt but in the Church. Externally the Apostolic communities were obliged to appear in the garb of Roman *collegia*, in order to secure legal protection. Therefore it became all the more necessary to base the inner life of the Church on living tradition. Were the case otherwise, would it not be surprising that Holy Scripture nowhere describes exactly the rite of baptism? Nay that it leaves us in doubt even as to the form employed by the Apostles. Should we not be astonished to find that even the feast of the Holy Eucharist is spoken of as something known, rather than described? But who, at that time, would have thought such a description necessary, seeing that all assisted weekly, or perhaps daily? It would be interesting, says a Protestant writer, and would greatly tend to allay sectarian strife, if we knew the precise way in which Christ and the Apostles gave thanks over bread and wine.[7] Nor is it less interesting to us Catholics. Since, however, Holy Scripture says nothing about it, or the little that it does say is not easily explained in a way acceptable to all, we hold that the Apostolic Churches, which have solemnized the mysteries as far back as the days of the Apostles, are the only recognized and competent interpreters of this solemnity.

For this kind of worship, to which none but the initiated were admitted, the Greek mysteries had furnished a precedent. After describing the Christian celebration of the Eucharist Justin remarks: "The wicked demons, in imitation of this, "have taught them to do the same in the mysteries of Mithra; "for you know, or may learn, that bread and a chalice with "water is laid before him who is to be initiated."[8] Christ

7 Herzog, *Real-Encycl. für Protest. Theologie*, etc. I. 49.
8 *Apol.* i. 66. Tertull. *De Praescr.* c. 40.

committed to the Apostles the mysteries of the kingdon of God, that they might hand them on and dispense them, and make them fruitful unto eternal life. He instituted the Sacraments for the worthy, and charged the Apostles to dispense them. In this sense, it is true that Christ did not "hand over to the "Church's keeping a fixed and unalterable deposit of revealed "doctrines and rules of conduct, from which she was to draw "(ready-made) articles of faith as the need arose."[9] In place of a dead scheme he instituted a living organism,—one endowed with every principle of social and spiritual vitality; capable of growth and development; adapted to all times and circumstances. Thus the existence and activity of Christianity were assured for all ages.

8. The Apostles certainly took thought for the future. The more they were conscious of knowing only Christ and Him crucified, the higher grew their conception of their duty as witnesses to the risen Saviour, and the more zealous waxed their efforts to provide for the future transmission of their doctrine, and for the maintenance of their ordinances and institutions. Paul thus exhorts Timothy: "Hold the form of sound words which "thou hast heard from me in faith, and in the love which is in "Christ Jesus. Keep the good deposited in trust, to thee by the "Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in us," (II Tim. I. 13, 14. "Keep "that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane "novelties of words, and oppositions of knowledge falsely so "called." (I Tim. VI. 20.)[10] The Apostle is here alluding not merely to doctrine, but to all things appertaining to divine worship. For the example of the Apostle both in his teaching and administrative capacity, was the model by which the beloved Timothy knew how he should walk in God's house. The Apostolic precepts and exhortations, that have been already mentioned, show clearly that the Apostles were fully convinced that, by appointing pastors and teachers, they had made provision for the maintenance of Christian truth and grace.

9 Hase, *Polemik*, p. 78.

10 See Tit. I. 9; II. 1-15; III. 8.

9. The Apostles also wrote Epistles, in which they gave further explanations upon certain points of doctrine, denounced abuses, and gave directions both for daily life and for divine worship. It is from them that we draw our demonstration; for by reason both of their character and contents, they bear out the point for which we are contending. Preaching nowhere began with Epistles. They were not the ordinary vehicle for the exercise of the Apostolic office, but were accessory and supplementary either to preaching or other personal work that had preceded. They were occasional writings, the occasion often being set forth in the Epistle itself. Moreover, they confine themselves to the topics that furnished the immediate occasion for writing. When the Apostle refers to traditions learned "by our Epistle," it is in an Epistle addressed to the same Church.[11] Nor does the more general address in the two Epistles to the Corinthians militate against this view. For the "saints in all Achaia" were in dependence on the mother Church in Corinth. The contents, too, of both Epistles, suppose and apply to a concrete case.

All this, however, does not prevent the Epistles being forwarded to other Churches to be read during divine service. Thus the Apostle recommends the Colossians to cause their Epistle to "be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans." (Col. IV. 16; See Ephes. I. 1). But we nowhere hear of a community being won over to Christianity or of being constituted in this way. In no Epistle is a systematic course of instruction given with a view to conversion, or for missionary purposes. All Epistles, even the more general Catholic Epistles, were addressed to communities, and deal with special matters that were intimately known to the writer. This is true even of the Epistle to the Romans which holds a unique position among S. Paul's Epistles, as it was addressed to a Church not founded by him, and of which he had no personal knowledge. Nevertheless it is not an epitome of Pauline dogma. But it

11 II Thess. ii. 14; I Cor. v. 9; II. Cor. ii. 3, 4, 9; vii. 8.

betrays a strong apologetic tendency, the explanation of which is to be sought not merely in the Apostle's position, but still more in the circumstances of the Church to which it was addressed.

10. We cannot discuss in this place whether or no the Gospels had been composed at this time.[12] If they really belong to an earlier period, the absence of allusions to them in the Epistles is all the more surprising (I. Cor. IX. 14; I. Tim. v. 18.) But if, as is probable, they are to be set down to a later period, this fact supplies a further proof for Tradition. * For it shows that the early ages were not solicitous about having complete reminiscences of the life of Jesus in writing. Anyhow the history of the origin of the Gospels shows that they were not written with the view of giving a full account of the life and teaching of Jesus, that should serve as a basis for preaching and instruction [13] Nor was there any need for this as long as eye-witnesses lived, or the living tradition of the first witnesses was still fresh in the memory. "To build up faith in Christ and to "foster the new-born religious life, it was sufficient to have "Apostolic preaching . . . , the Gospel concerning Christ, "which had little in common with the historical details in the "earthly life of Jesus."[14]

12 See Christ. Apol. vol. II. chap. xii.

13 *Chr. Apol. l. c.*

14 Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, I. 17.

* It is of the utmost importance for the reader to have a thorough grasp of the precise meaning of the word Tradition as it is here used. By Tradition people commonly mean any source of information other than written. But this is not the full meaning of the word as used by Theologians. The question to be solved in Theology is, by what method and principle believers are made: how are individuals to get their faith and knowledge of revealed truth. Is it from a book containing God's revelation, (Scripture-principle), or is it from living, personal and authoritative witnesses, appointed for the purpose of guarding and preaching and explaining all revealed truth (principle of Tradition). Tradition, therefore, in the theological sense of the term means a living institution, whose duty and office is to hand down to men all revealed truth. It has thus an active and a passive sense. Tradition in the active sense is the living authority that hands down revealed truth; in the passive sense it is the revealed truth as handed down by that authority. The Author shows that the principle of Tradition, not of Scripture, was used by Christ and the Apostles, and was made an essential and permanent factor in the Christian dispensation. Hence Tradition is both the rule and the source of faith for the individual believer; sacred Scripture itself being part of that Tradition taken in the passive sense. *Tr.*

From S. Peter's sermons, recorded in the *Acts*, we see that none but the chief events in our Lord's life formed part of the Apostolic preaching. And the Epistles bear out this view. As S. Paul was not an eyewitness of the life of Jesus, one might suppose that he would be at special pains to master all its details. But the very opposite is the fact. His general warning against another gospel has reference to everything that was not a necessary part of the Apostolic preaching and the general faith of the believers. In his Epistles he only refers to Christ's descent from David, to His death and resurrection. Nor can it be argued from I Cor. XI. 23* that he had a written text before him, whether v. 23 refers to an immediate or a mediate tradition. In other places, too, he constantly appeals to oral tradition. From the prologue to S. Luke's Gospel, it may no doubt be inferred that various attempts had been made to write sketches of the life of Jesus; but it by no means follows that they were authorized. Nor have we any evidence that such writings were employed for the purpose of evangelizing. Word of mouth, the preaching of the Gospel, was everywhere the instrument in propagating Christianity.

11. As far as writings were in question at all, it was chiefly the Old Testament, the Law, that was brought into requisition, as we learn from S. Paul's action in the Churches that he founded, and then it was but a means for consolidating the faith that already existed in them. Evangelists are, indeed, once or twice mentioned (Acts XXI. 8; II Tim. IV. 5); but their collocation with Apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers (Ephes. IV. 11) proves that they were a special class of teachers, not evangelists in the strict sense. Hence, if the Gospels were actually moulded on the recollections the Apostles had of our Lord's life, their authors in no way intended them to suppress or supplant oral teaching. Rather they desired, as occasion served, for special ends, to complete, confirm and

* "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread . . ." (I Cor. xi. 23).

deepen oral tradition in certain churches, as in the case of Matthew and Mark, or in certain individuals, taken as types of a class, as in the case of S. Luke. The prologue to S. Luke's Gospel supplies a formal explanation of this bearing of the Gospels on preaching and catechetical instruction. In S. John's Gospel the scope is expressly stated to be apologetic and dogmatic. (John xx. 31).

12. S. John's Gospel alludes repeatedly, and towards the end with especial emphasis, to the incompleteness of the fourth, and indeed of all the Gospels, on the ground that the life of Jesus was too crowded with incident to be wholly contained in any book. The Evangelists could compress their writings all the more easily as by most evident proofs passing daily under their eyes they were convinced of Christ's abiding presence, and of the Holy Spirit's work in the Church. Hence the Spirit of God cannot allow the Church's teaching and discipline to be ever destroyed or injured. Nor does He need a dead letter to pour abroad new life wheresoever He wills. For this reason the analogies from the history of religion are not altogether relevant. Buddha's disciples bethought them to collect the sayings and deeds of their friend and master, after he had left the world and entered into Nirvana. But Jesus had not entered into Nirvana. He had returned to heaven, to send down His own Spirit to abide with the Church for ever. Later generations, indeed, attempted to collect the oral traditions, but they thereby implicitly confessed that the first disciples had not thought it necessary to commit everything to writing.

13. Hence it nowadays passes almost for a truism that Scripture is more recent than oral tradition, and that the Church was founded and spread not by Holy Scripture, but by the living word.[15] In other words, the principle of Scripture is utterly unhistorical and unbiblical. The celebrated controversy between Lessing and Göze on the thesis that Religion is prior

15 Hase, p. 55. Holtzmann, *Synopt. Evangelien.* 1863, p. 50. 52. 60. For the older Protestant literature see Kuhn, *Quartalschr.* 1858, p. 188. Lessing, *Theolog. Streitschriften* etc. Leipzig, vi: 297. 316.

to the Bible, has long been decided in Lessing's favour. The only wonder is that, in the face of facts, the opposite plea could have ever been advanced at all, and defended with such clamorous and stubborn persistency. Nor, again, is there now any doubt that the Apostles sedulously impressed the spoken word, both for the propagation and maintenance of doctrine and discipline, on the hearts of their fellow workers and successors as well as on the faithful. Otherwise they must have fared badly. For the several Scriptures were not yet distributed among the Churches, no New Testament was in existence, and the Scriptures, neither individually nor collectively (even had they been collected), formed a complete handbook of Christian doctrine. The entire question of the Scripture-principle is out of place. It could only arise, if the Apostles had really drawn up a written summary of what they taught and ordained. But in regard to such, history is silent; nay it teaches the very opposite. The Apostles' Creed, which goes back to the earliest times, proves that the faith was planted, maintained, and spread by preaching; in other words, by the principle of Tradition.

II.—IN THE ANTE-NICENE AGE.

14. Of the organs by which the Apostlic doctrine was and is perpetuated, and by whose authority it is kept pure, we have already spoken. By committing to the successors, on whom they laid hands, the heritage of faith, they gave a guarantee that tradition, in the objective sense, would remain an unpolluted source of faith, and, in the subjective sense, would serve as the formal principle or rule of faith. The successors of the Apostles transmit the Apostolic legacy, and exercise the judicial authority necessary in important questions of faith.

"The Apostles," says *S. Clement*, writing to the Corinthians, "sent by Jesus Christ who was sent by God, preached the "Gospel to us. . . . . Hence after they had received "their commands, and had been strengthened, and filled with "conviction by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, they

"went forth with perfect confidence in the Holy Ghost, and "preached the advent of the kingdom of God." But for the benefit of future believers, they ordained bishops and deacons who were likewise to work in the Holy Spirit. "Here lies the root of the entire Catholic principle of Tradition."[16] And thus the relation subsisting between the Apostles and Christ and the Holy Spirit is set down as the pattern and beginning of the relationship in which the bishops stand to Christ. This is the chief message that Ignatius delivered to his age. Accordingly, the notion of tradition here given was very ancient in the Gentile Churches. Its elements are God, Christ, the Twelve, the Churches. It extends to doctrine, worship, and hierarchy. How is it possible, we ask, for him who has before his eyes the testimony of Holy Writ to the practice of our Lord, to the institution of the Apostolate, the solemn charge, and promises made to it, to the words and deeds of the Apostles, finally to the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers, how is it possible, with eyes open, to speak of the principle of tradition as an "historical fiction," and an "unhistorical excrescence?" Is it not rather true to say that the *Ecclesia Apostolica* and the *Charisma Veritatis*, inherent in its episcopate, far from being a "deviation of Christian doctrine"[17] is, on the contrary, the cause and reason why any Christian doctrine has been preserved at all! But to proceed with the historical proof.

15. The author of the Epistle *Ad Diognetum*, in the somewhat doubtful appendix, makes tradition the backbone of his teaching. The Church is preserved and gladdened by tradition as well as by the fear of the law, and the grace of the prophets, and faith in the Gospels. *Papias*, a disciple of S. John the Apostle, set to work to collect the sayings (*Logia*) of Jesus, as the disciples had received them from the lips of our Lord, and handed them down by word of mouth; for he thought the

16 Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 112; Clem. Rom. i. 42.

17 Weingarten, *Kirchengesch Tabellen*. 3 ed. 1887, p. 17. The German word is literally "an externalization." Tr.

reading of the Scriptures less profitable than the living word of tradition.[18] The "Presbyters" supplied him with what he desired. A "Presbyter," as a disciple of the Apostles, was with Irenæus a voucher, and with other fathers (Clement of Alexandria and others) the authority for their information. Hence the bishops are Presbyters (*Sacerdotes*) because "by "their succession they are witnesses and vouchers for the "tradition; they go back to the times that are past, and are "thus able to do what the disciples of the Apostles have "done."[19] Some writers, among them the author above quoted, are of opinion that, at the transition from the first to the second generation, the survivors of the first generation naturally became the Presbyters, and consequently the authority for tradition; that this rule applied both to the narrow limits of each community, and to the body of the faithful at large; and that this custom was the origin of the order of bishops (i.e. overseers), as a permanent status or office. But this is reading into the pages of history, not out of them. We have already seen that, in the time of the Apostles, there existed an office, of which the preaching and handing down of truth was considered an essential part. No doubt the elders were chosen by preference, as being the best witnesses of tradition, and as having the wisest heads for ruling the Church. For this reason Timothy is bidden not to impose hands on a neophyte (I Tim. III. 6.) The College of Elders among the Jews supplied a precedent in this respeet.

16. S. Polycarp, too, another disciple of John, like Papias, "stands decidedly nearer to the Catholic principle of tradition "than to the Protestant Scripture principle."[20] He exhorts the Philippians to abandon false teachers, and to return to the doctrine handed down from the beginning. The *Clementines* make Peter say: "Lend me your ears. It is well that each

18 Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39 (40).

19 Weizsäcker, *Apostel Zeitalter*, 1886, p. 642.

20 *Weiffenbach*, *Papiasfragmente*. 1824, p. 132. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift. für wissensth. Theologie*, 1875, p. 258.

"one, according to his ability, should help those who join the "faith of our religion. And therefore it should not be a burden "to you to instruct and to teach the ignorant, so, however, that "you hold fast to what I have delivered unto you, and thereby "clench the eloquence of your words. Do not put forward "what is your own and what has not been handed down to you, "even though it be quite true; but hold, as I have said, to "what I have received from the true prophets, and have "delivered unto you."[21]

17. S. Irenæus reminds his former friend Florinus of the instructions they received together from S. Polycarp, who told them all that he had heard from S. John and other eye-witnesses about Christ, and His miracles, and doctrine; he tells him how Polycarp preached all that the Scriptures had handed down concerning the Word of Life. "And what, through "God's great mercy, I then eagerly drank in, I have written "down not on paper, but in my heart, and by God's grace I "often recall it faithfully."

It is confessedly often difficult to prove that the Apostolic Fathers are employing the Scriptures, and especially the Gospels, as they for the most part quote from memory, or, more still, from tradition. At a comparatively early date, indeed, the Gospels, as well as the Epistles, may have been read aloud at divine service, although S. Justin is our first informant;[22] but the spoken word, preaching, was the ordinary medium for teaching and converting. "Clearly," says the writer of a life of Jesus, "the need for supplementing oral Tradition with writing only "arose after the generation of those who had heard the eye-"witnesses had died out. Then, oral Tradition began to grow "dim with age, and gradually to lose its lustre."[23] Anyhow, it is quite certain that the oral Tradition inherited from the Apostles and their followers was for a long period almost the only source of information concerning primitive Christianity.

21 vii. 37.
22 *Apol.* i. 67.
23 Weiss, i. 28.

Even in the early decades of the second century, it disputed supremacy with the Canon.[24] It is conceded, moreover, that the great Fathers of the fourth century, Basil, Chrysostom, and others, claimed for oral Tradition equal right with the written word, and demanded that the unwritten deposit, inherited from the Apostles, should, "without proof, be vested with the same "credibility as the Canonical Scriptures."[25]

18. The significance of living Tradition, and its relation to Scripture, was brought into prominence by the Gnostics, whose new-fangled doctrines, being diametrically at variance with the received teaching of the Church, had to be proved, or at least justified from Scripture and Tradition. They pretended, from the stores of their superior gnosis, to elaborate certain docrines of the Christian κήρυγμα (preaching) into a rule of faith. But they were not prepared to admit that the Tradition was public, or to connect its diffusion with any ecclesiastical organization.[26]

Irenæus and *Tertullian* were the Church's doughty champions against Gnosticism. Hence, too, they were the first to expound, of set purpose, the doctrine of Scripture and Tradition. Their object was not to "put Tradition on a level with "the New Testament, as if they thought that Tradition alone "was a sufficient weapon in controversies with heretics;"[27] but they intended to deal with the whole question of Tradition in all its bearings, and to show the necessity of the Tradition that began with, and flowed from, the Apostolic Church. For Gnostics were the aggressors. They assailed the Church's Tradition, and drove her to defend her bulwarks. They rejected the Old Testament; and, as to the New, it is admitted that "there was then no generally received teaching as to the reading "and constituent parts of the New Testament, and the interpre- "tation of Scripture, both within the Church and without, was

24 Semisch, *Denkwürdigkeiten Justins*, 1848, p. 399. Credner, *Einleitg. in die H. Schrift*. i. 36. Luthardt, *Der Johanneische Ursprung des 4 Evangel.* 1874, p. 37.

25 Semisch, p. 401.

26 Harnack, i. 188. Note 1.

27 Hase, p. 64.

"equally arbitrary." For these reasons Tradition, and naught else but Tradition, was competent to join issue with heresy in single combat. Ecclesiastical Tradition, as supported by the Church's authority, was the sole judge of controversies in matters of faith. And it would have been so, even had the entire New Testament Canon been collected and recognized. For, how else, if not by general Tradition, was "any generally received teaching" possible, if the interpretation of Scripture was equally capricious within and without the Church? From whom else, moreover, would the Canon have obtained recognition? Whence came the generally received interpretation? When, then, was there a change to the detriment of the principle of Tradition, and in favour of that of Scripture? We scarcely need remind our adversaries of their own admission that the Canon bears on its face the marks of greater youth than Tradition.

Appeal to Scripture, says Melchior Canus,[28] is common to almost all heretics. This is but giving voice to a thought often expressed by the Fathers. It was their experience that every heresy, taking pattern by the devil in tempting Christ, could quote one or other passage of Scripture. Howsoever diversified heresies may be,—whether Gnostics in the second century, Sabellians in the third, Arians in the fourth, Nestorians and Pelagians in the fifth, Cathari and Waldenses in the twelfth, and Reformers in the sixteenth,—they one and all reject Apostolic Tradition, and erect Scripture into a self-supporting formal principle.[29] The Gnostics, indeed, appealed to a secret Tradition come down from the Apostles. But their appeal was hardly intended *au sérieux*. Rather it was wrested from them by the fact that the principle of Tradition was universally acknowledged. A proof drawn exclusively from Scripture was,

28 M. Canus, iii. 1.

29 See Athan., *De Synod.* 13. 14. 40. 43. 47. Basil, *De Spir.* c. 10. Aug., *Coll. c. Maxim.* c. 1. *De Nat. et Grat.* c. 39. Cyrill. Alex., c. 39. Harduin, *Act. Concil.* II. 186. Möhler, *Symb.* p. 365. Somewhat differently Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1858. p. 40.

in those days, for reasons already given, an impossibility On the other hand, the Gnostics, seeing that the Old Testament tallied not with their teaching, threw it overboard in its entirety, while they clipped and snipped the New Testament Canon until it fitted their doctrines. Or they would appeal to their superior knowledge and insight. In either case, Scripture and Tradition were roughly mauled. "When, however, they are confuted "from the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse the same "Scriptures, as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and "[assert] that they are ambiguous, and that the truth cannot "be extracted from them by those *who are ignorant of tradition* "For [they allege] that the truth was not delivered by means "of written documents, but *viva voce*: wherefore also Paul "declared: 'But we speak wisdom among those that are "'perfect, but not the wisdom of this world' (I Cor ii 6). "And this wisdom each one of them alleges to be the fiction "of his own inventing, forsooth, so that, according to their "idea, the truth properly resides at one time in Valentinus, at "another in Marcion, at another in Cerinthus, then afterwards "in Basilides, or has even been indifferently in any other "opponent. . . . But, again, when we refer them to *that* "*tradition which is from the Apostles,* [and] *which is preserved* "*by means of the succession of presbyters in the churches,* they "object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not "merely than the presbyters, but even than the Apostles, "because they have discovered the unadulterated truth . "It comes to this, therefore, that these men do now consent "neither to Scripture nor to Tradition."[30]

Irenæus then proceeds to show that it is the height of unreason to suppose that the Apostles entrusted a secret tradition to the Gnostics. They must necessarily, he says, have entrusted it to the men whom they charged to watch over the Churches. He then singles out for special mention the bishops of Rome. Consequently, truth is enshrined in the faith of the Church.

30 Iren. III. c. 2 (Clark's Transl.). See Stieren, II. 254. Kuhn, p. 203.

Should important questions be in dispute, they must be referred to the oldest Churches, in which the Apostles conversed; there, certitude and clearness are to be found.[31] More especially he points to the Roman Church as the standard, because the Apostolic Tradition has been perpetually retained by her faithful, who are spread all over the world. The appeal to Scripture he dismisses with the remark that, while regarding Scripture and Tradition as alike sources of faith, he still upholds Tradition not only as a sufficient, but as a formal principle, of faith, inasmuch as the truth of Holy Scripture cannot be erected into a norma of interpretation, except through the instrumentality of Tradition. Tradition is the well-spring and head. With it rests the decision. It alone can set and keep faith firm. For this task Scripture is incompetent. "For how should it be if the "Apostles themselves had not left us writings? Would it not "be necessary, [in that case] to follow the course of Tradition "which they handed down to those to whom they did commit "the Churches? To which course many nations of those "barbarians who believe in Christ do assent, having salvation "written in their hearts by the Spirit, without paper or ink, "and carefully preserving the ancient Tradition . . . Those "who, in the absence of written documents, have believed this "faith, are barbarians so far as regards our language; but as "regards doctrine, manner, and tenor of life, they are, because "of faith, very wise indeed . . . If any one were to preach "to these men the inventions of the heretics, speaking to them "in their own language, they would at once stop their ears, and "flee as far off as possible, not enduring even to listen to the "blasphemous address. Thus, by means of that ancient "Tradition of the Apostles, they do not suffer their mind to "conceive anything of the [doctrines suggested by the] portentous language of these teachers, *among whom neither "Church nor doctrine has ever been established*."[32]

31 *Ibid.* c. 3.
32 Iren. iii. c. 4. See also c. 1 and 2. Also iv. c. 24.

As of old, S. Paul delivered the faith to the heathen without written proof, and by his efforts won greater victories for faith than the others, so S. Paul's method is repeated in the Church as often as barbarous tribes are converted by preaching and Tradition, without the Scriptures. On this point Augustine is thoroughly in accord with Irenæus. "He who steadfastly "takes his stand on faith, hope. and charity, needs no Scriptures, "except in order to convince others. Hence there are many "who live retired on these three, without books."[33]

The above passage from Irenæus was quoted by Lessing in his discussion with Göze. His eight axiom runs thus: "If "there was a time when Christianity was widespread, and "exercised sway over many souls, and yet possessed absolutely "no records in writing, it must be possible for all that the "Apostles and Evangelists have written to perish, while the "religion they taught would stand." The reader may with with advantage consult the passage in which Lessing describes Christians living in the Bermudas, and having no Bible.

Irenæus never intended either to disparage Scripture, or to degrade Tradition into a mere crutch for men who could neither know nor understand Scripture. But, in his idea, Apostolic Tradition was the first and chief means for spreading the faith and regulating divine worship; it stood as guarantor for Holy Scripture, and supplied the key to its interpretation. None but the Apostolic Churches have preserved the Apostolic Tradition; from their presbyters the truth is to be learned, by them our faith is saved, and Scripture safely interpreted. It is owing to them that we possess the complete and genuine Scriptures, without addition, diminution, or falsification, and can without danger of error interpret them correctly and precisely. For together with *Episcopal Succession* it has pleased the Father to grant them the *certain charisma* of truth.[34]

19. *Tertullian*, too, professes the same cardinal principles in

33 *De Doctrina Christ.* I. 39.
34 Iren. iv. c. 33, N. 8.

regard to the rule of faith. But he outstrips Irenæus in that he contrasts the principle of Tradition still more forcibly with that of Scripture. He simply challenges the right of heretics to settle points of faith from Scripture.[35] For apart from the fact that heretics falsify the fragment of Scripture that they receive, and coin endless varieties of interpretations that distort its meaning, it is in the nature of book-disputes and mere literary warfare that the balance may incline to either side. Faith, therefore, must be sought elsewhere; and it can only be found where Christ has deposited His truth. Traditional truth brands as lies all subsequent heretical concoctions. It is one and unchangeable, while error is shifting and manifold. There is an absolute and universal canon for knowing the truth:[36] "I say that my Gospel "is the true one; Marcion says the same of his. I affirm that "Marcion's Gospel is adulterated; Marcion, that mine is. Now "what is to settle the point for us, except it be that principle of "time, which rules that the authority lies with that which shall "be found to be more ancient, and assumes as an elemental "truth that corruption (of doctrine) belongs to the side which "shall be convicted of comparative lateness in its origin. For, "inasmuch as error is falsification of truth, it must needs be "that truth therefore precede error. . . . On the whole, then, "if that is evidently more true which is earlier, if that is earlier "which is from the very beginning, if that is from the very "beginning which has the Apostles for its authors, then it will "certainly be quite as evident that that comes down from the "Apostles, which has been kept as a sacred deposit in the "Churches of the Apostles." Heretics are a later growth, that cannot be grafted on the Apostolic Churches. And therefore Catholics have the very truth itself; they cling to the rule of faith that the Church has received from the Apostles, the Apostles in their turn from Christ, and Christ from God.[37] "For "this reason it is that he calls the heretic 'self-condemned,'

35 *De Praescr.* c. 15 et 37.
36 *Adv Marc.* iv. 4, 5. cf. v. 19. *De Praescr.* c. 29, 30.
37 *De Praescr.* c. 37.

"because he has himself chosen that for which he is condemned. "We, however, are not permitted to cherish anything [in "doctrine] after our own will, nor yet to make choice of that "which another has introduced of his private fancy. In the "Lord's Apostles we possess our authority; for even they did "not of themselves choose to introduce anything, but faithfully "delivered to the nations the doctrine which they now received "from Christ."[38] He, then, goes on to say that even an angel from heaven cannot alter this rule.

For this reason, heretics, by rejecting the teaching of the Apostles who wrote the Scriptures, have no right to appeal to the Scriptures. Nor, again, may they interpret them, because they lack Apostolic truth. For the truth of the Scriptures, of the interpretation thereof, and of all Christian Traditions, must be where the truth of discipline and of Christian faith abides.[39] Nay Tertullian goes so far as to maintain that the Scriptures were ordained by the will of God to provide material for error, that the word of the Apostle might be fulfilled (I Cor. XI. 19). For, were there no Scriptures, there would be no heresies.[40] He explains his meaning by saying that heretics, in casting aside the rule of faith, and relying on their own conceit to interpret Scripture, use the Scriptures to find a plausible justification for their heresy On this point Tertullian could speak from experience. As to the value of controversies carried on with Scripture only as a basis of operation, he remarks: "Now this heresy of yours does receive certain "Scriptures; and whichever of them it does receive, it "perverts by means of additions and diminutions, for the "accomplishment of its own purpose; and such as it does "receive, it receives not in their entirety; but even when it "does receive any up to a certain point as entire, it nevertheless "perverts even these by the contrivance of diverse inter-

38 *L. c.* c. 6.
39 *L. c.* c. 19.
40 *L. c.* c. 39.

"pretations. Truth is just as much opposed by an adulteration "of its meaning as by a corruption of its text . . . Though "most skilled in the Scriptures, you will make no progress (in "disputing with heretics), when everything which you maintain "is denied on the other side, and whatever you deny is (by "them) maintained. As for yourself, indeed, you will lose "nothing but your breath, (and) gain nothing but vexation "from their blasphemy."[41]

But the Scriptures are not, on this account, to be despised. Tertullian assigns them their true position in the Christian œconomy. They are instruments in the hands of the qualified workman, that is the Church, for building up the faith. They are instruments of proof, when read and interpreted in the spirit of the Church. This is a favourite expression of his. Thus Tertullian speaks of the evangelical instrument, consisting of the four Gospels; of Apostolic instruments, to wit the Acts of the Apostles, S. Paul's thirteen Epistles; of the instrument of John in which he reckons the Apocalypse and S. John's First Epistle. Besides these there is an appendix to the Apostolic instruments, which includes S. Peter's First Epistle, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle of Jude. Tertullian was a lawyer, and as such he would know the value of instruments. What use he made of them, we can see from his books against Marcion. But with him, as with other authors, Tradition, as embodied in the rule of faith, was a fixed principle.[42] It was "the shield handed down from our forefathers, on which "they received every hostile thrust. It was the Christian "conscience itself, transmitted in history,"[43] the conscience of the Apostolic Churches, of the Catholic Church. The rule of faith, considered objectively as the stock of teaching inherited from the Apostles, and in its subjective sense as the living consciousness of faith pervading the whole Church, formed the ground and standard of faith.

41 *Ib.* c. 17.
42 *De Praescr.* c. 13. *De Vel. Virg.* 1.
43 Hase, p. 65.

20. Nor was the *Greek Church* aware of any other plan for defending the faith. It had the same rule of faith as umpire in controversy, although it did not assume an attitude of utter hostility to Gnosis, and reject it as unceremoniously as Tertullian did. Like Irenæus and Tertullian, *Clement of Alexandria* complains bitterly that heretics capriciously misuse Holy Scripture. Firstly he shows that the deposit (I Tim. VI. 20) i.e. Christ's teaching, has come down to us through the genuine Apostolic Tradition. It is laid down in Scripture which must be explained by the Canon of truth. For neither the Prophets nor our divine Redeemer unveiled the divine mysteries so plainly that all could see and understand them. For the rest, all words are right to them that understand (Proverbs VIII. 9), i.e. to them who receive from the Church, and keep the explanation that Christ Himself gave of the Scriptures. "The "liars, then, in reality are not those who for the sake of "the scheme of salvation conform, nor those who err in "minute points, but those who are wrong in essentials "and reject the Lord, and, as far as in them lies, deprive "the Lord of the true teaching; who do not quote or de-"liver the Scriptures in a manner worthy of God and of the "Lord; for the deposit rendered to God, according to the "teaching of the Lord by His Apostles, is the understand-"ing and the practice of the godly Tradition. And what "ye hear in the ear, that is, in a hidden manner, and in a "mystery (for such things are figuratively said to be spoken "in the ear)—proclaim, He says, on the house-tops, under-"standing them sublimely, and delivering them in a lofty "strain, and according to the Canon of the truth explaining "the Scriptures; for neither prophecy nor the Saviour Him-"self announced the divine mysteries simply so as to be "easily apprehended by all and sundry, but expressed "them in parables . . . But all things are right, says the "Scripture (Prov. VIII. 9), before those who understand, "that is, those who receive and observe, according to the "ecclesiastical rule, the exposition of the Scriptures ex-

"plained by Him; and the ecclesiastical rule is the concord "and harmony of the law and the Prophets in the covenant "delivered at the coming of the Lord." [44]

Clement, indeed, refers in the passage just quoted, and elsewhere, to a secret Apostolic tradition, but in a widely different sense from the Gnostics. He had no thought to overthrow ecclesiastical tradition. His object was to soar from it to a higher insight into the truths of faith.[45] He refers to the verbal communications of estimable men who, in different parts of the world, preserved the true tradition of what Christ had taught, as they heard it from Peter, James, John, and Paul. As Christ initiated them into the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and opened their eyes that they might understand the Scriptures, so they, in turn, imparted this knowledge to their followers, and transmitted it to posterity. To all men of every degree, whether high or low, bishops or laity, the Apostles bequeathed this rule of faith;[46] but only the spiritual gain that insight which the Apostles gave, when preaching and instructing in the Spirit of God. Infants must be fed with milk; solid food is for the perfect. (I Cor. II. 6).

But "true gnosis and genuine *αἵρεσις* is only to be found in the ancient Church." Heretics have neither learnt nor received the truth, but have fallen away from it. "For those who make "the greatest attempts, must fail in things of the highest "importance; unless, receiving from the truth itself the rule of "the truth, they cleave to the truth. But such people, in "consequence of falling away from the right path, err in most individual points, as you might expect from not having the "faculty for judging of what is true and false, strictly trained to "select what is essential. For if they had, they would have "obeyed the Scriptures. As then, if a man should, similarly "to those drugged by Circe, become a beast; so he, who has

44 *Strom.* vi. 15. (Clark's Transl.)
45 *L. c.* c. 15. Also c. 7
46 L. c. vii. 15

"spurned the ecclesiastical tradition, and darted off to the "opinions of heretical men, has ceased to be a man of God, "and to remain faithful to the Lord."[47] The true gnostic is he who "having grown old in the Scriptures, and maintaining "apostolic and ecclesiastic orthodoxy in doctrines, lives most "correctly in accordance with the Gospel."[48]

Thus, according to Clement, there are, indeed, two guides in religious knowledge, but not a "double-faced Christianity: one "for the common herd, and another, concealed beneath its "surface, for the wiseacre."[49]

20. *Origen* follows in his master's (Clement) footsteps in all points except on the question of secret tradition. An epitome of his teaching anent Tradition is found in the preface to "*De principiis.*" "All who firmly believe that grace and truth came "to us through Christ . . . draw wisdom from Christ's "words and teaching. . . . Since, however, many who "profess to believe in Christ swerve from the right path, not "only in that which is little and trivial, but also in that which "is great and important . . . it is necessary to lay down "a rule at once fixed and clear. . . . We must hold fast "to the Church's teaching, which has come down in an "unbroken line from the Apostles, and has continued in the "Church to this day. Only that is to be believed as Christian "truth, which deflects not by a hair's breadth from ecclesiasti- "cal and Apostolic Tradition." In these words Origen has laid down the rule of faith and Christian science, notwithstanding the veneration which he, like Irenæus, had for Scripture as God's word,[50] and the arguments he drew from it, especially in his controversy with Celsus. This goes without saying, but it gains emphasis by repetition. As long as the *Disciplina arcani* prevailed, Christianity did not reach the outside world except through the medium of the sacred books. From these Celsus

47 *L. c.* vii. 16 (Clark's Translation). See Möhler, *Patrologie*, p. 455.
48 *Ibid.*
49 Lessing, *Werke*, Leipzig, vi. 309.
50 See *In Jerem.* 21. n. 2. *In Num.* 27.

derived his plan of attack on Christianity, and his calumnies against the faith and virtues of Christians. What, then, more natural, than that the defender of Christianity should carry war into the same territory, in order to dislodge the enemy from his entrenchments?

How little satisfaction Origen derived from the letter of Scripture is shewn by his allegorical method, which was based on the Church's faith and tradition. Truth, as transmitted and enshrined in the Chnrch, is the starting-point of his theology, the goal of his apology, and the rule of his exegesis. The truth of the Church becomes more intelligible and gains in the estimation of an opponent, if it be also contained in books which, though written by uneducated men, far surpass all heathen wisdom. In the early chapters of Genesis the Apologists discerned the quintessence of all wisdom, and consequently of Christianity.[51] They declared that heathen philosophers had drawn from Scripture whatever truth they possessed. Who, then, can be surprised if, in controversy with the heathen, they should have ransacked the Scriptures for proofs? Like all Christians, they got their faith from the Church. But they used the Scriptures in support of the ecclesiastical rule of faith, to drive home conviction to the heathen, and to perfect themselves in understanding the articles of faith. No doubt ever crossed their minds about the perfect harmony of Scripture and Tradition. A Scripture dogma, such as Origen calls the Resurrection,[52] is not in opposition to a Traditional dogma. For he himself goes on to say: "We cling with all the tenacity "of our soul to the faith of Christ's Church, and the great "promises of God." Lessing had certainly the better of Pastor Göze, when he asked somewhat pointedly: "Are, then, "two different things contrary one to the other?"

22.* We have quoted at some length the evidence for the principle for Tradition, as a source and rule of faith, from the

51 Harnack, I. 408: Note 2.

52 C. Cels., v. 22. Cf. *De Princip.* II. 10.

chief representative writers of the first few centuries. The testimonies are as precise, definite, and emphatic as they are general and varied. In all cases, whether in controversy with heretics, or in the tranquil search after a higher and deeper understanding of revealed truth in Scripture and Tradition, the writers agree that Tradition,—ecclesiastical preaching, the living consciousness of the Church—determines both the contents and the rule of faith. The unanimous teaching of these early Fathers, moreover, perfectly accords with what we have learnt from the history of the New Testament concerning the foundation of the Church by our Lord, and its propagation by the Apostles. This, then, being the fixed and well established order in the whole Church, and a fundamental condition of its existence and life, we are justified in asking whether it is conceivable that a change, a radical change, of principle could have subsequently taken place? Yet there are writers who have tried to persuade the world that in course of time such a radical change came to be adopted. It is said, that the time came when "truth was pitted against usage," and "Scripture against "Tradition." Let us examine whether this objection can be sustained.

III. *OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.*

23. The first protest against the hitherto universally recognized sovereignty of Tradition, is alleged to have come from the African Church.[53] To Stephen, Bishop of Rome, when he justified the custom of his Church in not baptizing heretics anew, by an appeal to *Ita traditum est*: "Thus it has been "handed down from my predecessors," Cyprian replied: "Whence is that Tradition? Does it come from the authority "of Christ and of the Gospel, or from the Apostolic Epistles? "For those things that are written must be observed, as God "bears witness. When He spake to Josue: Let not the book of "this law depart out of thy mouth, but take care to observe all "that is written herein. Also the Lord, sending His Apostles,

53 Hase, p. 63.

"commands that the nations should be baptized, and taught to "observe all things which He commanded. If, therefore, it is "either prescribed in the Gospel, or contained in the Epistles "or Acts of the Apostles, that those who come from any heresy, "should not be baptized, but only hands laid upon them to "repentance, let this divine and holy tradition be observed. ". . But in vain do they worship me, teaching the doctrines "and commands of men (Isaias). The Lord, too, in the "Gospel, similarly rebukes and reproves, and saying: Ye reject "the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own "tradition." Cyprian then goes on to say that custom shorn of truth shows but the baldness of error. The decision rests not with custom but with reason. Our Lord says in the Gospel: "I am the truth." He said not: I am the observance. So when truth is made manifest, custom must yield.[54] And the further annotation is added from Tertullian [55]: Our Lord called Himself truth, not custom.

24. After what we have heard, *Tertullian* might well be left in peace. Scarce any Father has fought so hard for the principle of Ecclesiastical Tradition. And thus the passage cited cannot overthrow his fixed principle. Still it will be interesting to define its bearings more exactly. The question in dispute is as to whether virgins should be veiled in Church. Tertullian is trying to prove that this is required by truth, which no prescriptive rights can gainsay—neither length of time, nor personal favour, nor local immunities. By these agencies a custom, originating in ignorance or stupidity, is generally translated into action, takes firmer root as time goes on, and is set up in opposition to truth. But our Lord Jesus Christ called himself Truth not Custom. As Christ always was, and existed before all things, so truth likewise is ancient and eternal. Let them see to it, who regard that as new which is old. Heresy is convicted not so much by its own novelty,

54 *Epist.* 73, 2-3; 74, 2.
55 *De Virg. Vel.* c.

as by truth. Even an old custom, if not founded on truth, will grow into a heresy. So far Tertullian. But is it difficult to perceive a difference between this, and the principle of Tradition? There is no question of an Apostolic Tradition, but of a custom (*consuetudo*), taking its rise in stupidity, which had sprung up in defiance of ecclesiastical discipline. Moreover, be it noted, Tertullian appeals, not to Scripture, but to Christ, who is ever living and abiding in His Church. Finally, to remove all doubt, Tertullian finishes by appealing to the "one unalterable and irreformable rule of faith." If only this rule be held firm, other points of discipline and social innovations may, with God's grace and the help of the Holy Spirit, be corrected.

One assertion may, indeed, excite surprise, viz.: that heresy betrays itself more by its opposition to truth than by its novelty, whereas the whole treatise *De Præscriptionibus* is almost entirely taken up in formulating the contrary principle. Unless we can bring ourselves to see here traces of the Montanist error,—and they are perceptible,—the two principles can only be reconciled by understanding 'truth' to mean the living truth in the Church. And a passage in another treatise of the same Apologist tells in favour of this view. Tertullian is giving a list of customs,[56] not specified in Scriptures but ratified by a usage that undoubtedly flowed from Tradition. He proceeds thus: "And how long shall we go on, sawing backwards and for-"wards upon this line, when we have an old established ob-"servance, which, in preventing the question, hath decid-"ed it? If no Scripture hath determined this, assuredly "custom hath confirmed it, which, doubtless, has been de-"rived from Tradition. For how can a thing be used, un-"less it be first delivered to us? But, thou sayest, even "where Tradition is pleaded, written authority ought to "be required. Wherefore let us enquite whether none, "save a written Tradition, ought to be received. Cer-

56 *De Coron.* c. 3.

" tainly we shall deny that it ought to be received, if there " be no precedents to determine the contrary in other ob- " servances, which, without any Scripture document, we " defend on the ground of Tradition alone, and by the sup- " port of consequent custom."* For the ceremonies used in Baptism, he continues, for the Eucharist, and sacrifices for the dead, for customary acts during prayer, and for the use of the sign of the cross on all occasions,—for these and other disciplinary practices there is no warrant in Scripture. " For these and such like rules if thou requirest a " law in the Scriptures, thou shalt find none. Tradition " will be pleaded to thee as originating them, custom as " confirming them, and faith as observing them."

25. *Cyprian* uses the same expression, and gives the same turn to his phrase as Tertullian. " For we must follow not " the customs of man, but the truth of God."[57] This remark is levelled at some who were wont to say mass without wine. Against their practice he appealed to Christ and the Apostles. His letter opens with the striking words: " Although I know full well that most bishops, set by Di- " vine Providence over the Church of Christ in all lands, " hold fast to the prescription of Gospel Truth and the " Lord's Tradition, still I deem it necessary and conducive " to the interests of religion, to write to you, so that, " should any one find himself entangled in that error, he " may, after seeing the shining light of truth, return to the " root and fountain head of the Lord's Tradition." What, then, after all, is Cyprian fighting against? An innovation that some had adopted in saying mass,—an innovation in glaring contradiction with the Gospel Tradition. Thus he writes to Cornelius: " As the sacredness of divine Tradi- " tion and ecclesiastical discipline, equally with truth, de- " mands."[58]

The same remark holds for the passage above quoted. For the custom against which Cyprian wished to raise a protest

57 *Ep.* 63, 14; 71, 3.

58 *Epist.* 45, 1.

* De Coron. c. 3. (Oxford Transl.)

was not Apostolic Tradition, but human ordinances set up in rivalry to what Christ had instituted. The principle is right, but its application wrong. In his mind the Roman custom was not an Apostolic Tradition, but a human ordinance. Like Firmilian, he wrongly supposed heretical baptism to be analogous to the aforementioned usages, and a mere point of discipline; although, at times, he strongly insists on the consequences for salvation of the opposite view.* Cyprian was perfectly aware that a genuine Apostolic Tradition can never clash with either truth or reason. Had he conceived the recognition of heretical baptism to be an Apostolic Tradition, he would not have said that in spiritual matters we must follow what the Holy Spirit has ordained for the best. But against what he thought a purely human custom he was free to assert vigorously the rights of reason and Scripture.

Had he not believed that the principle of Tradition was on his side, and that he could summon the tradition of the African Church to witness in his favour, he would probably not have spoken with such vehemence. At the outset, at least, he intended merely to enter the lists against the custom that had crept into several churches. "Although," he says, writing to the bishops of Numidia, "although you stand by the truth "and constancy of Catholic discipline, yet because, in that "charity which is common to us all, you have thought fit to "ask our advice, we lay before you our teaching which is not "new, but has been handed down from our predecessors in the "hoary past, and has been observed by us."[59] In the body of the Epistle he says: "If there had never been a command or

59 *Ep.* 70, 1; 74, 2. 10. See August., *De Bapt.* III. 2. 12. Hefele, I. 122. Ritchl, *Cyprian*, p. 98.

* Considering the language and arguments invoked by S. Cyprian, it is hard to see how he can be said to have considered the question as one of mere discipline. But it is quite clear that he did not look upon the Roman custom as an Apostolic Tradition. From this it might be inferred, perhaps, that the Tradition was not *universally* and *explicitly* known, but lay *implicitly* hidden in that fuller understanding of Christian dogma of which the *Cathedra Apostolica* has the key. Cyprian's theological reasoning is wrong. It must be remembered too that the distinction between the *valid* and *lawful* administration of the Sacraments was at that time not clearly brought out. Tr.

"prescription at all merely to lay hands on heretics unto "penance, and then to admit them to communion . . . is "it not stubborn and arrogant to pit human traditions against "a divine decree?" "If, at any point, truth reel or stagger, "we must return to the divine source, and to the tradition of "the Gospels and Apostles." "The view that converts from "heresy must be baptized is not new in our Church, nor has it "hastily sprung up."[60]

In appealing to this tradition of the African Church, Cyprian was incorrect, as may be gathered from his own statements, according to which Agrippinus (220) is the oldest authority. The author of *De rebaptismate* shows that his contention was wrong, and Augustine points out the same thing.[61] Cyprian's demand was almost universally regarded as an innovation, and as such abandoned at last even by the Africans. This was inevitable, once passion cooled down, and a clear view of the facts and merits of the case was obtained.

26. The Letter of *Firmilian* of Cæsarea shows very clearly the standpoint taken by the several parties engaged in this controversy. Stung to the quick by Pope Stephens' sharp rebuke and order to look to Tradition, he reproaches the Romans with not observing the traditions in every case, and with vainly sheltering themselves behind Apostolic authority. In proof, he instances the differences about Easter, and other liturgical points. But in regard to heretical baptism, he says, the Pope cannot appeal to Apostolic Tradition, because at that time there were no heretics. If then, he proceeds, each Church has a right to appeal to its own tradition, the true tradition on this point is to be found not in Rome or Africa, but in Asia Minor. For the power to forgive sins was vested in the Apostles and the Churches they founded in Christ's name, and in the bishops, their successors and representatives. If then,

60 *Ep.* 73. 3.

61 *De Rebapt.* c. 1 (apud Migne Tom. iii. p. 1183). Aug., *De Bapt.* ii. 7, 12. Vinc. Lerin., *Comm.* c. 9. Schwane, i. 736. Döllinger, *Hippolytus*, p. 192.

he says, Stephen appeals to this succession from Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, he ought not to make heretics cornerstones. Hence the Roman tradition is a purely human invention, the merest custom, to which even a Jew might appeal against Christianity. But, he concludes, truth must prevail, and the Africans score against Stephen at least in this that they have forsaken the error of custom for truth. "But we blend custom with truth, and to the custom of the "Romans we oppose the custom of truth by adhering firmly "and consistently to what Christ and the Apostles have handed "down. Nor can we remember the time when it began, for it "has always existed in our midst."[62] Verily Firmilian had here forgotten what he had previously said about the impossibility of this Tradition having an Apostolic origin. But it is plain from his words that the controversy was not about the principle of Tradition, but about true tradition as opposed to a particular human custom.*

27. That *Augustine* should be put forward, as opposed to the universal supremacy of the principle of Tradition, is indeed more than strange. Scarcely any one of the later Fathers has so forcibly defended this principle against heresy and schism, and the importance of his evidence for the Catholic principle

62 *Ep.* 75, 19. See Hagemann, *Römische Kirche*, p. 17.

* The above answer of the author is good as far as it goes. But an adversary might press the point that, though Cyprian and Firmilian did not contend against the principle of Tradition generally, but rather invoked it on their own behalf, still they reject the specific Catholic principle of Tradition, in which the Apostolic See of Rome is the main factor. For of the authority of this See they speak lightly, and put it no higher than that of any other Episcopal See founded by the Apostles. It is vain, they tell the Pope, to shelter himself behind his Apostolic Authority. In answer to this difficulty we have to remark, first that, as a matter of fact and on their own confession, the Pope did shelter himself behind his Apostolic authority, and that it ultimately prevailed. Secondly that they did not *reject* that Apostolic authority, but *objected* to it in this particular instance. The reason of which is quite intelligible from their point of view For supposing, as they did, that there existed an explicit tradition contrary to that of Rome, and really traceable to the Apostles, it would be a clear proof that the Roman custom was not Apostolic, nor could the Apostolic authority, in that case, come into play For it was not conceivable that on this point there could be two contrary Apostolic traditions (in so far this case differs from the custom of keeping Easter). Thus there is no evidence to show that Cyprian and Firmilian were ignorant of or rejected the specific Catholic principle of Tradition. *Tr.*

of Tradition is generally acknowledged.[63] Here and there one or other stray expression akin to those used by the early Africans may be discovered; but the discordant note, if such there be, is drowned in the general harmony of his doctrine as a whole. To prove this formally will be all the easier, because the controversy about heretical baptism led Augustine to discuss Cyprian's position. While praising Cyprian for remaining within the Church's unity despite his conflict, he cannot allow his view to pass. Cyprian's appeal to a supposititious tradition, he argues, finds no support in the tradition of the Church, as is clear from his own words. But when he appeals to truth, Augustine gives him the correct answer: "Of course, no one "doubts that custom must yield to revealed truth. But what "revealed truth really is we shall presently examine more "closely. Meanwhile, even he confesses that another custom "was in existence in the Church."[64]

But, there is another objection raised from S. Augustine. The rule of faith, they say, is, in his opinion, neither more nor less than the quintessence of Holy Scripture. "Those words "(of the rule of faith or creed) which you have heard, are "scattered over the pages of Holy Scripture, but have been "gathered together into one (symbol) to aid the memory of "slow-minded people."[65] But this simply means that Augustine, like other Fathers, takes for granted that Tradition and Scripture are in accord on the essential articles of faith. It does not follow that in their eyes the creed was but an extract and summary from Scripture, though it was an epitome of the truths of faith, which are expanded in Scripture. The symbol of faith, as Cassian remarks, is indeed a short compendium of the two testaments, of the whole law of God, containing the whole meaning of the Scriptures. It comprises exactly that

63 See Reuter, *Augustin. Studien* 1887, p. 307. *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1887, Nr. 15.

64 *De Bapt.* III. 6. *Ep.* 38.

65 *Sermo* 213. Cf. Faustus Reg., *De Spir.* Prefat. Cassianus, *De Incarn.* vi. 3. Isid., *De Offic.* II, 22. Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 415. Cyrill. Hier., *Catech.* v. 12.

which suffices to make a Christian; it is the basis and key to all further progress in Christian knowledge—*clavis Scripturae.*

28. Hence *Cyril* of Jerusalem, too, requires first of all that the faithful should firmly believe in their hearts the creed of the Church. He then promises to show, on another and more suitable occasion, how the truths of the creed are contained in the sacred Scriptures. "Lay hold on that faith which the "Church hath delivered to thee, and Scripture hath ratified." When, therefore, he says that this compendium is taken from the entire Scripture, inasmuch as the chief truths have been selected and put together, he means nothing more than that it is in complete conformity with Scripture. He occupies the same standpoint with regard to Scripture as the Church has ever occupied even till this day. The Bible serves for proving and confirming her teaching, and for giving a deeper insight into its truths. But the creed is the Christian's *Vade Mecum,* and ecclesiastical Tradition the source and formal principle of faith.

29. The instruction of Catechumens did not begin with Holy Scripture, but with an explanation of the several articles in the Apostle's Creed.[66] Faith came by hearing, and hearing by preaching, which consisted in setting forth the Church's living belief in the Creed. Before beginning his exposition of the Creed, Cyril pointedly observes: "But before I deliver to "you the faith, I think it will be to the purpose to give a brief "summary of the necessary articles of faith."[67] And in conclusion he says: "This we are taught by the inspired Scriptures "of the Old and New Testaments." "But learn from the "Church which are the books of the Old, and which of the New "Testament." "Read the two and twenty books of these "Scriptures; and have nothing to do with the uncertain books. "These only study earnestly, which we read confidently even in "the Church. Far wiser than thou, and more devout, were

66 *Catech.* v. 1.

67 *Catech.* iv. 2, 33, 35. Aug. *Ep. Fund.* c. 5. Cf. Joann. Damascen., *De Imag.* Or. iii. 41.

"the Apostles and ancient bishops, the rulers of the Church who "have handed down these: thou, therefore, who art a child of "the Church, trench not on their sanctions." This agrees with S. Augustine's famous aphorism: "I would not believe the "Gospel unless the Church's authority moved me thereto." Hase, indeed, thinks he has taken the sting out of this saying by covering it with ridicule. He remarks: "Here we may read "between the lines what was later on exaggerated into a Roman "article of faith (where? when?), namely: without the pope I "should not value the Bible above the Koran."[68] But the phrase only shows that Augustine, like the other Fathers, notwithstanding his high appreciation of the deep mysteries buried in God's word, required an infallible authority to vouch both for its genuineness and interpretation. Such an authority was to be found nowhere but in the Church. Faith, without visible authority, was unknown to the ancients, for it could not but rest on the shifting sands of human opinion. And Holy Scripture by itself could not be that authority, neither has it ever passed current as such. *

30. Holy Scripture was held in the highest esteem. But then it was the Scripture of the Church; the Scripture that was given to her to guard and explain; it was the instrument

68 P. 67.

* It is a fundemental article of faith with Protestants that Scripture is the sole source and rule of faith. This is the theory, but not the practice. Protestants are brought up and trained to believe the few revealed truths that form their creed, in exactly the same way as Catholics, namely by the principle of tradition. The Scripture principle is a practical impossibility. As a matter of mere history we know that Protestants have founded, as they were bound to do, their own communions and churches more or less in imitation of the Catholic, have adopted a creed, symbolical confessions, articles of faith, and proposed certain books as the inspired word of God. But by doing so they practically exercised authority, and made tradition the basis of operations. Then they proceeded in theory to deny that authority and tradition, and to set up the Scriptures as the vital principle of their Church and Churches. This self-stultifying process constitutes the essence of Protestantism. Theory and practice stand in glaring and flagrant contradiction. It is the hugest fraud ever imposed upon the human mind. In vain, for three hundred years, Catholics have pointed out the inconsistency and hollowness of the system. It was reserved for the critical school, with its keen and incisive weapons, to show that the Bible is not a vital principle except in the Catholic Church. For the Bible, like the soul, is a vital principle only in the body to which it naturally belongs. "What God hath joined together, let no man put as der." (Tr.)

of her teaching, as Tertullian has it, so that by its means she might build up the faith with greater facility, and endow it with greater riches. The praise bestowed by the Fathers on Scripture, applies to Scripture as in harmony with, not in opposition to, the ecclesiastical teaching. If, since the days of Clement, many holy Fathers have unreservedly exhorted the faithful to read Holy Scripture, and have assented to all that the New Testament says about the benefits to be derived from reading the Old; if again, the Greek translations of the Old Testament, and the Latin of both Old and New were rendered into the vernacular; what, then? The principle of Tradition is not thereby in the least compromised. For, both before and since, Tradition was the well-head and rule of faith. Instruction and preaching in the Church's faith was the starting-point, and instruction in Holy Scripture followed. Translations notwithstanding, the Sacred Scriptures were not the common property of the multitude of the faithful, since very few knew how to read. The translation into the vernacular—if Greek, as the universal language of the educated, and Latin as the language of the Roman Empire can be so called—were undertaken chiefly in order to render the Scriptures accessible to the Western Church for liturgical purposes. Very few Fathers understood Hebrew, and in some Western provinces just as few were conversant with Greek. Even the African Fathers, Augustine included, had not perfectly mastered it.

But, considering the dearth of literature, how could these translations have served the purpose of propagating the faith? How many manuscripts found their way into private hands? Was, there, a British and Foreign Bible Society in those days? Lessing,[69] in his great controversy with Göze, who wanted to saddle the Middle Ages with ignorance of the Bible, says, "the codices of the New Testament grew apace "with time. In the first and second centuries such codices "were very scarce, so scarce that entire communities possessed

69 *Werke*, vi. 603.

"but one copy which the presbyters kept under lock and "key, and which no one was allowed to read without their "leave." "The stubborn fact is that the Bible never came "into the hands of the common folk before the ninth cen-"tury. They knew just as much and no more about it than "the clergy chose to teach them." After the canon had been fixed, the Church's mode of teaching was more closely bound up with Holy Scripture, which then came to be regarded, in so far as it was attested and explained by oral Tradition, as the first and foremost fount of revealed truth. The people gained their knowledge of it from sermons and instructions. The very Fathers who, in some passages, mention Scripture alone as God's word, elsewhere speak of Tradition in similar terms. They looked upon the two as inseparable, and as giving expression to the same divine truth that was preached from the beginning.[70]

31. This was shown very clearly in the Arian Controversy. Arius was a disciple of Lucian of Antioch.[71] From the School of Antioch he learnt logical formalism and the system of literal and grammatical exegesis. The rise and spread of Gnosticism had compelled the teachers in the Church to cultivate sacred exegesis with greater care and assiduity. Hence arose the great schools of Antioch and Alexandria. But the method of the latter school, namely the allegorical system of interpretation, was ill suited to cope with an adversary, such as Arius, trained in the school of Antioch. Any one who will not shrink from the labour of comparing S. Athanasius' controversial writings against the Arians with his exposition of the Psalms will perceive how very different is the method employed in the two. Against the Arians, he was bound to give a scientific explanation of Scripture based on the faith of the Church, while the Psalms left him free scope for drawing practical applications. It was only with great reluctance that the Council of Nicæa adopted a non-biblical phrase (ὁμοούσιος) into the Creed. Only

70 See Kleutgen, *Theologie der Vorzeit*, III. 958.

71 Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, p. 13. Harnack, i. 598. Petavius, *Proleg.* iii. 1.

when the Fathers saw that the Eusebians were cloaking Arian ideas with biblical phraseology, did they determine upon a formula, which, though not couched in the letter of Scripture, effectually clipped the wings of heresy.[72] Their first business was, not to elaborate the faith from Scripture, but to define and formulate in unequivocal terms the Church's teaching. A formula composed of Scripture words would doubtless have been preferable, because Scripture was, at that time, the common ground between the Arians and the Church, whereas the early heretics, as a rule, called in question the books of the Canon. The same method had likewise to be applied against later heretics. The more heretics set their face against precise definitions and fell back on Scriptural generalities, the more painstaking were the efforts made by the Fathers to fence the faith round with definite terms and formulæ, and, at the same time, to defend it by the books of Scripture. Hence the injunction given by Pseudo Dionysius not to think about the supernatural and hidden Godhead anything that is not divinely expressed in Scripture.[73]

32. This method of using Scripture did not begin with Nicæa, and it is quite gratuitous to say that from this time onward there was a change of front in the principle of Tradition. The Ante-Nicene Christians, despite the rule of faith, set great store by Scripture; the Post Nicene Christians, despite their great esteem for Scripture, held fast to the rule of faith. The principle is one and the same,—the Church's living magisterium, and the infallibility of the Church's teaching office, which has from the beginning upheld and guaranteed the unity and purity of faith. The same Athanasius who declares that "the sacred Scriptures are sufficient to teach truth," says immediately afterwards: "The Scriptures are, indeed, sufficient, "and preach the truth without fail. But there are also many "other works, bearing on them, composed by our saintly

72 Möhler, *Athanasius*, i. 233. Hefele, i. 307.

73 *De Div. Nom.* c. 1. S. Thom. i. q. xxix. a. 3. ad. 1; q. xxxii. a. 2; q. xxxix. a. 2.

"teachers, from which the reader may learn to interpret Scrip-"ture, and may acquire the knowledge of the truth he is "seeking."[74] No one who calls to mind his judgment on Arius and heretics generally for misusing Scripture,[75] will feel inclined to rank him with the partisans of the Scripture principle as against Tradition. Even the devil's mouth, he says, is honeyed with Scripture phrases in order to dupe and mislead men.

33. *Eusebius* of Emesa (350) is also paraded as an advocate of the Scripture principle. "What need is there," he asks, "of you and me? Let us look to the evangelists. Believe "what is written of the Father and Son, and pry not curiously "into what is not written. Oh! that we would rest satisfied "with Scripture! Then controversy and strife would be at an "end! For what, then, may we search? For that which is in "Scripture."[76] What more is here said than that men should eschew the sterile subtleties that were then agitating the East? Nay, if we bear in mind that Eusebius was on the Arian side, his words may perhaps imply a suppressed taunt that the Catholic Church did not recognize the one-sided principle of Scripture!

34. Nor is the statement of *S. Augustine* more to the point than the preceding passages, especially when viewed in the context. He says: "Whoever takes another meaning out of "scripture than the writer intended, goes astray, but not "through any falsehood in scripture . . . For if he takes "up rashly a meaning which the author whom he is reading "did not intend, he often falls in with other statements which "he cannot harmonize with this meaning. And if he admits "that these statements are true and certain, then it follows that "the meaning he had put upon the former passage cannot be

74 *Adv. Gent.* c. 2.

75 *C. Arian* I. 8.

76 Thilo, *Über die Schriften des Eusebius von Alex. und Emesa.* Halle 1832. p. 73. Hase, p. 66.

"a true one: and so it comes to pass, one can hardly tell how, "that, out of love for his own opinion, he begins to feel more "angry with scripture than he is with himself. And if he "should once permit that evil to creep in, it will utterly destroy "him. '*For we walk by faith, not by sight.*' *Now faith will* "*totter, if the authority of scripture begin to shake.* And then "if faith totter, love itself will grow cold . . . And so "these are the three things to which all knowledge and all "prophecy are subservient; faith, hope, love . . . *And* "*thus a man who is resting upon faith, hope and love, and who* "*keeps a firm hold upon these, does not need the Scriptures except* "*for the purpose of instructing others. Accordingly many live* "*without copies of the Sciptures, even in solitude, on the strength* "*of these three graces.*"[77] Augustine, as we see, demurs to scripture interpretation based on private opinion, even of men of learning such as S. Jerome. He holds that a man with faith, hope and charity, has no need of scripture except to instruct others. And does he not give to commentators this advice: in doubt to consult the rule of faith that they have learnt from clear passages of scripture, and the authority of the Catholic Church?[78] Finally, why does he reject the Apocrypha? Was it merely because their authors deserve no credit? or was it rather because they contain false statements "which the "Catholic and Apostolic rule of faith and sound doctrine "condemn?"[79]

35. The fact is that statements such as the above are as true in the Catholic Church to-day, as they were in the time of S. Augustine. Their meaning is clear. Faith in Scripture will waver, only if faith in the authority of the Church falters. Again, Scripture is all-sufficient, for two reasons; first because it testifies to the authority of the Church as the formal principle of our faith, and secondly because it contains all the cardinal and central doctrines of Christianity. These are clearly and

77 *De Doctr. Christ.* i. 37. *Ep.* 19 (82). Hase, p. 67.
78 *De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 8; iii. 2. Cf. *C. Faust.* xxviii. 2. 4. 6.
79 *De Cons. Evangel.* i. 1, 2. See Aberle-Schanz, p. 287. Petav., *Prol.* ii. 41

unmistakeably set forth in Holy Scripture. For this reason the Fathers in establishing them as "*veritas evangelica et apostolica*," would naturally draw their proofs from Scripture.[80] But did they so act in other points that were either not contained in Scripture at all, or not so clearly? Certainly not. Thus Augustine was at great pains to show that his doctrine of grace had always held sway in East and West. For the West his standard authorities were Cyprian and Ambrose. Cyprian shows that "as our faith is the true, nay, the Christian and Catholic "faith," and "as it was of old transmitted in the Scriptures, "so, when heretics sought to undermine it, it was steadfastly "maintained and preserved by our fathers, and with God's "grace will be so preserved in the future."[81] He refers Julian to the answer given by Innocent I. which contains what the Apostolic See, the Roman and other Churches have held from the beginning.

IV. THE POST-NICENE AGE.

36. Apart from the few isolated passages quoted to the contrary, it will not be a difficult task to show that the principle of Tradition dominated the post-Nicene and subsequent periods. To this end we cannot forbear to quote once more Lessing's reply to Göze: "It is wholly undeniable that oral Tradition was "at one time the only source of truth; and it is absolutely "impossible to fix a time when it not merely became a secondary "source, but when it ceased to be a source at all."[82] In giving particular proofs we are embarrassed which passages to choose from out of the multitude. *Athanasius*, in laying down the doctrine *De Spiritu Sancto*, says: "Let us, likewise, turn our "eyes towards Tradition and the teaching that was from the "beginning, and the faith of the Catholic Church, [to know "the doctrine] which the Lord has given, which the Apostles "have announced, and the Fathers preserved; for it is founded "upon the Church, and whoever falls away from it, can no

80 Petav., Prol. i. 10: Langen, *Kirchenväter*, p. 10.
81 C. *Duas Epp. Pelag. ad Bonif.* iv. 12. *Op. Imp. c. Jul.* i. 13

"longer be or be called a Christian."[83] And *Gregory of Nyssa* observes: "To prove our doctrine we have only to point to "the Tradition of the Fathers, which, being a legacy from the "Apostles, has come down to us through successive generations "of saints." *Chrysostom*, the great panegyrist and exponent of Scripture, says: "We may believe that all the teaching of the "Apostles was not done by letter, and that they taught much "without the Scriptures. So let us also believe in the Church's "Tradition. It is Tradition. Ask no more questions."

How did the Emperor Theodosius proceed, when he wished to uphold the legality of the *Latrocinium?* He did not dare to defend his action in any other way but by making an express appeal to Tradition. The most reverend man (Leo) ought to know "that we have not swerved in any one point from "the religion and tradition of our forefathers. Our only wish "is to preserve intact the mysteries bequeathed by Tradition "to our Fathers. And hence, seeing that some Churches were "going astray after shameful innovations, we decided to hold "a Synod in Ephesus."[84]

37.* The *Commonitorium* of S. Vincent of Lerins (d. about 450) contains a summary of the Church's teaching. He lays down the proposition that the true faith is known, first by the authority of the divine law, and then by the tradition of the Catholic Church. As a guide to the latter he gives the canon: "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est.*" That is to say, tradition is established from the writings of the early Fathers, those at least who, persevering in the Catholic faith and Church, have in every age and clime been recognized as teachers; who, in her communion, lived holily, taught wisely, and persevered with constancy, and either died peacefully in Christ, or were privileged to lay down their lives for His sake.[85]

83 *Ep. i. ad Serap.* n. 28 Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 432. Franzelin, *De Trad.* p. 214. Gregor. Nyss., *C. Eunom.* iv. 653 (Migne). Chrys., *In II Thess Hom.* iv. ad ii. 14.

84 *Ep. Leonis* 62.

85 *Commion.* c. 39. See M. Canus, III. 4. Petav., *Prol.* II. 4.

Now, strange to say, in modern times, this very canon has been enlisted in the service of the foes of ecclesiastical Tradition. They contend that, in her most recent decisions, the Catholic Church has distinctly broken through this general traditionary principle, that nothing is ever to be believed but what has been taught always, everywhere, and by all *explicitly* and distinctly. But this cannot be the meaning intended by Vincent, for the simple reason that he, more than any other Father, insists upon the necessity of doctrinal development in the Church; and development supposes that certain revealed doctrines are but implicitly and obscurely contained in the deposit; or, again, that new aspects and new relations of old truths may be brought to light.* The controversy between Augustine and the Semipelagians fully convinced him that something more was required than mere extracts from the Fathers. There is another reason why S. Vincent could not have understood his canon in that way. If nothing is to be believed but what is *semper et ubique et ab omnibus traditum*, there was no need for a rule or guide, because what is so handed down cannot be unknown, but must be plain and evident to all. The universality of time and place, therefore, which the saint had in view, could not be an absolute, but only a relative one. Catholicism, of course, has an inherent tendency towards universality;[86] and wherever this actually exists, it is a certain proof of the truth. Whence it follows that the theological student will be guided by that principle, and prefer the more universal to the less. As a matter of fact the Vincentian Canon, as it stands, is a general affirmative proposition, and logicians tell us that it cannot be converted into a general negative.

Vincent himself gives a clue to the explanation, when he answers the question: What is man to do, if some renounce their allegiance to the Church? In such a case his advice is,

86 M. Canus, *l.c.* Scheeben, I. 146. 150. Kleutgen, I. 75. Franzelin, *l.c.* p. 284 seq.

* See our remarks in the Preface to this volume. Tr.

to abide by the majority,* by the Church. And in these words he makes the source and the rule of faith join hands. Tradition objectively considered, as maintained by the majority [relative universality] is the source of faith, but the living authority of the Church is the guide, criterium, and rule of faith. She decides what is the Tradition of the past; she is the true witness of what was and is in her consciousness. Hence only those Fathers can truly witness to Tradition who are in communion with her. In the same way, it belongs to the Church, he says, to interpret Holy Scripture; her faith, her mind is the key to the understanding of Scripture. In itself the latter is perfect and all-sufficient; but owing to its depth and difficulty, it is exposed to different interpretations, and consequently requires a sure and unerring interpreter. Such is the *mens et sensus Ecclesiæ*.[87]

He delivers himself, not less lucidly, on the relations subsisting between Councils and Tradition: "What object has the Church "in holding Councils, but to give definiteness to her faith in "that which she previously believed indeterminately? to preach "with zeal what had hitherto been preached sluggishly? to "develop with care what had hitherto been wrapped in the "stillness of simple belief? This, I say, and none other, has "been the goal towards which the Catholic Church, spurred on "by heretics, has ever been pressing forward in her conciliar "decrees. What she had received from her ancestors by "Tradition, she expressed in written documents for the sake of "posterity, comprising many things in a few words, not imparting "a new sense to the doctrines of faith, but, for the sake of "clearer understanding, fixing the old meaning by a *new term.*" S. Vincent, then, is perfectly consistent with himself and in

87 *Common.* c. 2, 32, 33.

* So also S. Augustine, *de Doctrina Christ.* ii. 8: "In the Canonical Scriptures, let "him follow the authority of as many Catholic Churches as he can ascertain, and "among these, such to whom it has been vouchsafed to have Apostolic Sees, and "receive their Epistles. In those Scriptures which are not received of all, let him "prefer those *received by the greater number, and the weightier authorities* to "those held by the fewer and less weighty." *Tr.*

complete accord with the Catholic principle both of development, and of Tradition.

38. When it is a question of searching into Tradition and finding out what belongs to it and what does not, we have to distinguish with S. Augustine between the negative and the positive element in Tradition. In his remarks on Infant Baptism, he says that in Scripture he can find in its favour naught but a conjecture borrowed from its type—circumcision. But to any one requiring a convincing proof he thus addresses himself: "That which the entire Church "firmly holds, and has not been introduced by any council, "but has always been held, is most justly believed to have "been handed down from the Apostles."[88] This principle was often invoked and applied in the so called argument of prescription. The proof from Tradition holds good in the case of any doctrine or institution of universal standing in the Church, that cannot be shewn to have sprung up at any one time in opposition to existing doctrines, although equally complete and certain positive testimony is not forthcoming from all periods. To take another instance, in the controversy about heretical baptism. Several African Synods, held under Cyprian's auspices, and also several Synods in Asia, had declared in favour of re-baptism. Here, then, custom was pitted against custom, and tradition against tradition. But Augustine was able to shew that the tradition in favour of the validity of heretical baptism was of immemorial antiquity, and that the universal Church had ever steadfastly adhered to it.

39. In the preceding pages we have frequently alluded to the fact that the Fathers laid special stress on the principle of Tradition in matters concerning divine worship and the sacred Liturgy. The "confirming custom" [consuetudo confirmatrix] of which Tertullian and Cyprian speak, was, and continued to be, all-powerful. In the later Greek Church, which is "*the* liturgi-"cal Church," the principle was not only maintained, but

88 *De Bapt.* iv. 24.

stretched beyond all due limits. Its unbending rigidity has tended to fossilize worship, and stiffen the sinews of religious life. From among the many testimonies that might be quoted,[89] we will limit ourselves to a few. *S. Basil* treats this point very fully. "Of the Church's mysteries and doctrines, some we get "from the written word, others we have received from the "tradition of the Apostles, who surely handed them to us. But "both have an equal religious force. This no one will deny "who has had the least experience in ecclesiastical matters. "For if we maintain that unwritten usages are less potent, we "are unwittingly wounding the Gospel in the heart, nay we are "dwarfing and crinkling the Gospel itself into a mere name."[90] After instancing many such usages in the Eucharist, Baptism and Prayer, he continues: "Time would fail me were I to set "forth in order the Church's unwritten mysteries." These words are written by the same Basil who in a Homily against the Anti-Trinitarians says: "Believe what is written; enquire "not after what is not written."[91] he also made Holy Scripture umpire between the Catholic and Arian doctrine, because custom was pitted againt custom.

40. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, as the name implies, are concerned with the Apostolic deposit in matters affecting ecclesiastical order and discipline, as well as liturgy. Even though they be not the work of the Apostles, and though, in the present form, they be the outcome of long experience and development, still they give the groundwork of ancient discipline according to the earliest sources. For the better maintenance of discipline, the ancient councils promulgated Canons, laying down principles to meet varying circumstances in time and place, and building up in detail the constitution of the Church. Although these Canons were not irreformable,

89 See Probst, *Liturgie*, p. 6: Kuhn, p. 436. Laugen, Kirchenväter, p. 7.

90 *De Spir.* c. 27. n. 66. 67. 71. See Nirschl. *Patrologie*, ii. 171. Kuhn, p. 435-437 ·Hieron., *Adv. Lucif.* n. 7. 8.

91 *Opp.* ii. 611. The passage is considered as not genuine by Garnier, cf. *Ep.* 139. 3 (Ppp. iii. 277.)

still the Church would be loath to deviate from them, especially as they date back to the Apostolic age. Leo the Great, when rejecting Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, over and over again appealed to the injunctions of the Holy Canons of Nicæa; for he saw, once the sacred ordinances of the Fathers were by a tittle transgressed, that an ecclesiastical regulation would be exposed to the same corroding influence.[98]

41. From this some have concluded that the Fathers chiefly viewed Tradition as supplementing Holy Scriptures, and this only in minor and subsidiary points, such as those of liturgy. According to what we have said above on the principle itself, this is not only generally incorrect, but demonstrably false in the particular matter of liturgy. For liturgy was intimately bound up with faith. The ceremonies and prayers used in Baptism and the Eucharist contain the belief in the reality of the sacraments; the baptismal formula embodies the chief dogma of the Church. Augustine's saying "*Lex supplicandi est norma credendi*" holds good in a still greater degree for important liturgical acts of worship. From the exorcisms used in Infant Baptism, Augustine deduces belief in original sin; from the prayers sanctioned by the Church, asking God's grace to begin a work, arose Celestine's faith in preventing grace. And no one can fail to see how instinctively the old Liturgy explains our Lord's words of institution at the last supper.

S. Basil distinctly points out his correction between faith and liturgy. Like Tertullian he views the use of the Creed at Baptism not as a ceremony but as a confession of faith in the Trinity. "If nothing but what stands in Scripture is received, "then neither will this the doxology Gloria P. et F. cum "Spiritu S., as proving the divinity of the Holy Ghost be "received But if most mysteries (i.e., the Church's important "ceremonies and actions) are received (on traditional grounds), "without being contained in Scripture, this may also be received "in conjunction with many other things. I consider it Apostolic

98 *Epist.* 107. cf. 104, 3; 106, 3, 4.

"I. Cor. XI, 3; II. Thess. II. 14) to hold also to unwritten "Traditions."[93]

42. To us it seems labour lost to pursue the proof any further. The Scholastics occupy the same position as the Fathers,[94] and there is nothing new to add. Nay, it is now generally conceded that "for more than a thousand years "Scripture and Tradition stood peaceably side by side in the "Catholic Church, Tradition taking under its capacious wing "doctrines of faith as well as religious customs and ceremonies; "things old and new (!) In fact it coincided with the authority "of the Church itself."[95] Gratian assigns to Tradition, sanctioned by the Church, the same authority as to Scripture.[96] At times it may have happened that, in this or that instance, an appeal to Apostolic Tradition was made hastily and without sufficient warrant, because the knowledge of antiquity was for a long time rather defective. Even in the Fathers we sometimes meet with uncertain appeals. But these trifles do not affect the stability of the principle on which they rest. The principle itself stands firm and unmoved. It is universally recognized that Apostolic Tradition under the Church's magisterium, is the formal principle of faith; and that the Church frames her decisions on Scripture and Tradition as the two founts of faith. In the eyes of the Scholastics the authority of Scripture and Apostolic Tradition was bounded by the authority of the Church. Without that authority the sources of faith themselves stand in mid-air. They lack the external credentials.

43. Nor is there any solid objection from latter ages against this universal consent of Fathers and Schoolmen. Will Abelard's *Sic et Non*,—a work in which passages from the Fathers, really or apparently contradictory, are placed in juxtaposition—overthrow the principle of Tradition? The Fathers, indeed, diverge widely from one another in scientific exegesis,

93 *De Spir*, c. 29. N. 71.
94 Schwane, iii. 51 f.
95 Hase, p. 67.
96 *Decret.* P. 1 D. 11. c. 3.

but if, as is reasonable, those only are admitted as witness who continued in communion with the Church till death, not in matters of faith and morals. To understand the Fathers aright we must distinguish between the essential and accidental, the general and particular. Nor may difference of time be ignored. As to mediæval Theologians, none regret Tradition, except such as took up a questionable attitude towards the Church. And it is quite conceivable that they should have sought to bolster up their own weak position by denying or disparaging Church authority. Occam, the founder of Nominalism, and Marsilius of Padua (A.D. 1328) are instances in point. Others, like Wiclif and Hus, went still further. And thus the way was smoothed for erecting Scripture into the one source and rule of faith.

V. AT THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION AND SINCE.

44.* The Reformation, says Hase,[97] "based its justification "on Holy Scripture. Its one endeavour was to bring the "Church back to primitive Christianity. Of course only partial "success waited on its efforts, as no phase of human life ever "comes back without some change." Luther set Scripture in the balance against all the sayings of the Fathers; it outweighed all angels, men, and devils, all art and learning. Still it was not Luther's first intention to lead back the Church to primitive Christianity, which itself was not biblical; nor did he mean to make the principle of Scripture his guiding star. Rather he had already excogitated his doctrine of justification by faith, before he looked for it in Holy Scripture. This doctrine, which became the material principle of Lutheran faith, rests on a single, badly translated, passage in one Epistle (Rom. III. 28), and is quite incompatible with Scripture as a formal principle of faith, unless we suppose that Luther was inspired, and that Scripture is explained to each one individually by the same Divine Spirit. But this dream, indulged in for a time, was soon dispelled by the number of contradictory interpretations

97 P. 68.

given to such passages as that concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper.

45. The clearest proof that Holy Scripture, apart from Tradition, cannot be the sole formal principle of faith, is to be found in the invention and adoption of symbolic confessions. These speak louder than all the arguments adduced for the *sufficientia*, *perspicuitas*, and *efficacia* of Holy Scripture. For they are practically a confession that a coherent doctrine of Church-membership cannot be gathered from the Scripture principle. We may say that the majority of Protestants have abandoned the position originally taken up by their forefathers. "That Holy Scripture is not revelation itself, but the herald "and witness of revealed history; that the men who wrote the "Scriptures, not the Scriptures themselves, are inspired; that "Scripture cannot be, nor was intended to be God's infallible "word, in the sense of being an authoritative body of doctrine "given by God;" these are "great, self-evident truths, and "recognized as such in all biblical science."[98]

This contradiction between the material and formal principle is openly admitted. "If the evangelical Church had "maintained these principles [i.e., justification by faith alone, "and, Scripture the sole source and rule of faith] . . . . "in such Catholic fashion that the privilege of Church member-"ship depended on their unqualified recognition, it would be a "mere bastard Catholicism, and not a distinct form of Christi-"anity, as its contention would rest solely on the Catholic "principle, viz.: the infallibility of the Church. But this the "Evangelical Church, by the very terms of its existence, has "renounced. Hence this juxtaposition of equal principles "made it possible, on the one hand, for the material principle ". . . to be shelved by the formal, unless it could be "proved from Holy Scripture; on the other hand, as the "formal principle itself cannot be proved from Scripture, it

98 Weiss, *Theol. Lit. Zeitg.* 1884, Nr. 19. See Volck, ap Zöckler, I. 652. Kuhn, p. 40. *Einleitung*, pp. 52. 68. 94. Heinrich I. 752. Röhm, *Confessionelle Gegensätze*, I. 109.

"must rest on the authority of a Church which makes no "pretensions to infallibility. Thus these two principles "might become contrary one to another."[99] Even Grau, who thinks that the Church must stand or fall by the doctrine of justification by faith alone, avows that the formal principle cannot consist unless the material principle is *believed* to be correct, and unless the reformed doctrine agrees with Holy Scripture.[100]

"To reject dogmatic Tradition root and branch as an "article of faith, on the principle that God's word is found "nowhere but in Holy Scripture[101] is not to reject all au-"thority outside Scripture. For the Reformers, but none "others, with their symbolical books stepped into the place "occupied by Apostolic Tradition and Church authority. "Subsequently the Lutheran and Reformed symbols ac-"quired an authority equal to that attaching (to the three "oldest symbols). Of course this came about in the sup-"position that they were in accord (with Holy Scripture). "But the supposition soon faded out of sight, and the idea "that Scripture could by any possibility have been in any "way erroneously interpreted in the symbols never crossed "people's minds. And thus, in Catholic fashion, an au-"thentic ecclesiastical interpretation was placed side by "side with Scripture."

46. Hase will have it that it was now for the first time, and in consequence of the Lutheran position, that the Roman Church became fully conscious of the vast significance of Tradition. Now, he says, she fully realized "that "to surrender infallible Tradition would be suicidal; for "all the doctrines against which the Reformers protested "as abuses and innovations, derived their divine right "from Tradition." But was not the situation exactly the

99 Hase, *Hutterus Rediv.* 9 ed. 1858, p. 13. See Simar, *Theologie des h. Paulus.* Freiburg, 1883, p. 2, note 1. Döllinger, *Kirche*, p. 427. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigungslehre*. II. 363. Beck, *Erklär. des Briefes a. d. Römer*. 1884, I. 307. Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, pp. 101, 121, 439.

100 *Evangelische Geschichte*, II. 19. *ap.* Zöckler, I. 551.

101 *Art. Smalc.* II. 17. Hase, *Polemik*, p. 69. *Formul. Concord. Proem.* I. *Confess. Helvet.* II. 1. Strauss, *Glaubenslehre*, I. 111.

same when Gnosticism arose? Have not Irenæus and Tertullian asserted in so many words that the Church's Tradition is divine? Has not Augustine emphatically declared that the authority of the Catholic Church safeguards the canon and exegesis, ecclesiastical usages and discipline? So convinced were men in the Middle Ages that the Church possessed infallible authority to teach, that they felt no need to offer special proof for it, or to explain the sources of faith more minutely. They drew their faith from the Church's living conscious faith, which, as was considered self-evident, tallied with the Apostolic faith. And as the Gnostics, in their own peculiar way, had helped to build up the Canon and systematic Theology, so the Reformers were the occasion of a more precise proof from history for the source and rule of faith. But they gave occasion for this not merely by protesting against doctrines and Tradition, but by undermining the whole fabric of Church doctrine by their exclusive Scriptural principle. The doctrines of justification, good works, the Church and the Sacraments, were no mere ecclesiastical customs, but the fundamental dogmas of the Christian faith.

47. "Even as late as the time of the Council of Trent," Hase further remarks, "bishops rose and characterized as godless" the attempt to place Tradition on an equal authority with "Scripture."[102] Thereby he wishes to insinuate that the contrary practice prevailed in earlier times. And yet he declaims against the neglect of Scripture in the Middle Ages, and remarks, almost in the same breath, that Scripture and Tradition had stood side by side in the Catholic Church over a thousand years! The isolated expression quoted above is not, however, of much importance, as the Bishop of Chioggia, who uttered it, withdrew it in the same session. Probably it was aimed only at Tradition in disciplinary matters. Sarpi has quoted it, not as used by a bishop, but as a Lutheran proposition, against which the Council framed its decrees. Anyhow it was without influence on the Synodal decree. Nay

102 Pallavicini xi. 14, 4. See Speil, *Die Lehren der Kath. Kirche*, 1865, p. 65.

all the members were shocked and filled with indignation against such unheared of language. Not "by the pressure of "circumstances," but "by the logical consequence of the "principle of Tradition which had ever been in force in the "Church, the Synod was driven to issue the decree," which puts Tradition in matters of faith and morals on an equal footing with Scripture. For Tradition proceeded from the mouth of Christ to the Apostles through the Holy Spirit, and, has been, as it were, handed down from age to age in unbroken succession down to the present time.[103] These Traditions, not contained in Scripture, refer to truth and discipline, to faith and morals, and are partly dogmatic and partly disciplinary in their nature. The Council of Trent names Apostolic Traditions, and Traditions that come immediately from Christ; but it regards the former as emanating from the Holy Spirit working in the Apostles. Bellarmine, too, distinguishes between divine, Apostolic, and ecclesiastical Traditions. M. Canus instances as Traditions not clearly expressed in Scripture: Mary's perpetual virginity, Christ's descent into hell, Infant Baptism, Transubstantiation, the *Filioque*, the consubstantiality and the relations of the three divine persons to one another. As doctrines neither clearly nor obscurely expressed in Scripture he instances: the words of consecration in the Mass, the veneration and intercession of Saints, communion under both kinds, and the conferring Confirmation and Holy Order but once; the reception of the Canon without warrant from Scripture. In developing the proof for the Apostolicity of a Tradition, he draws a distinction between dogmatic and disciplinary Traditions. As an illustration of the latter, he gives the decree of the Apostolic Council. Purely ecclesiastical Traditions belong to this Category.

48.* The Reformers proceeded with strange inconsistency. Many Traditions purely ecclesiastical and liable to change (e.g., feasts and portions from the liturgy), they retained, but regarded

103 *Sess.* iv. cf. Bellarm. *De Verbo Dei.* iv. 3. M. Can [illegible]

them as human institutions. Next they rejected Traditions, closely bound up with faith, such as the doctrines of Purgatory, indulgences, veneration of saints, and many Traditions anent the Sacraments, while retaining others, e.g., Infant Baptism.

49. Hase, however, contends that both Churches have acted consistently with their principle in regard to Tradition as a rule of faith : Protestants allow its *historical* value, and pass judgment on its reliability . . . while Catholics protect it from the fate that awaits all things human with the shield of Church infallibility. So far he is right. But then he goes on to infer that the Church is able to shield with infallible wisdom much that is either not contained in Scripture at all, or only hinted at, or even rejected. In this he is very much mistaken. For the one thing that is clearly set forth in Holy Writ is the institution of the Church, and the perpetuity of the Apostolate (principle of Tradition) to teach the faith to all nations. Moreover, he does not seem to realize the exact and full meaning of an infallible Tradition. What is really infallible, is not the Tradition, but the Church, its organ. As Christ was infallible, so by His gift were the Apostles, and so is the Church for all time. Hence, there can be only a formal difference between the Tradition of one age and that of another.[105]

50. We have already stated in the chapter on the infallibility of the Church, that Catholic Tradition includes two elements, a human and a divine ; neither can displace nor dispense with the other, but one perfects the other. Hence we have said, that tradition, even when viewed from a human and merely historical standpoint, offers the strongest possible human guarantee. The unity of the faithful among themselves ; their esteem and reverence for the faith, i.e. the word of God ; the watchfulness that the *Ecclesia Docens* and the faithful, and the several communities exercise over one another ; the way in which most of the truths of faith are translated into action in practical

105 Möhler, Symbolik. p. 371.

life and in the liturgy; all these are most efficacious means for preserving Tradition pure and undefiled. For here there is no question of difficult and complicated problems, but of the simple summary of Christian truths that live in the heart of the faithful, and are enshrined in the symbols and writings of the Fathers.[106] "In this one article," (concerning the person of Christ), says Kepler, "the sayings and proofs of "the old Fathers are of greater value to me than the explanation "of the [Protestant] formulas of agreement." His appeal to the teaching and faith of the early Fathers led him to reject the Reformation. He preferred excommunication to professing a doctrine that, he was convinced, contradicted Scripture and Tradition.[107] "We would willingly," says a modern Theologian, "be in agreement with the ancient Church. And from the "first the Fathers of the Lutheran Church sought to establish "their connection with it." But the "impression will never be "effaced, that a deep gulf yawns between the Reformed Church "and primitive Christianity."

51. The newly discovered Catacombs supply silent but eloquent testimony to the truth of Catholic Tradition. Gravestones, inscriptions, paintings, and other remains, attest in clear unfaltering tones, that the life led by the early Christians and martyrs was Catholic. Of the holy sacrifice of the Mass, of the Sacraments, of Purgatory as a place of purification, of Prayers for the dead, they supply many remarkable indications. Clearly the Catholic Church hankers not after novelties, seeing that many of her institutions can here be traced back to the second or third century. *Roma Sotteranea* comes as a valuable supplement to the history of old Rome, which has been exposed to the ravages of time and man's hand.

Possibly, at times, conclusions are drawn too hastily in explain-

106 Möhler, p. 374. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 72. Staudenmaier, Dogmatik i. 44, Tanner, *Das Kathol. Traditions=und das Protest. Schriftprincip.* Luzern 1862, p. 13. Röhm, i. 207.

107 Schuster, *Johann Kepler*, p. 164. Wagner, *Theol. Lit. Cl.* 1885, p. 283. *op* Röhm, iii. 45.

ing some of the pictorial symbolical illustrations. Hase instances Marche's attempt to refer the seven baskets in the multiplication of the loaves to the seven Sacraments, whereas in other pictures the baskets vary in number from one to eight, and in the first miracle twelve baskets are mentioned. But, after all, this is but a single instance that leaves the question itself untouched. And yet even here it is not without significance that the ancient artists consistently represented the two miracles as having seven baskets of fragments remaining, and not the larger number twelve. Augustine referred the feeding with seven loaves to the grace of the Church, "which is strengthened by the well-"known sevenfold activity of the Spirit."[108]

52. Nevertheless, we fully admit that the historical or scientific demonstration of Catholic doctrines from Tradition is at times beset with many difficulties. But that it must be borne in mind that the same class of difficulties bestrew the path of the history of dogma and indeed of all history. Wherever human agency is at work, human imperfections mar its efficacy. Hence the enquirer must look well to the object and method of his enquiry. Tradition is completely enshrined, implicitly at least, in the writings of the Fathers. But the Fathers neither set it forth in systematic order, nor was it their intention to give a complete enumeration and exposition. The need for any such thing was felt by them as little as by the Apostles. Hence it is quite intelligible that in many points they held divergent views. We must not confound their speculative views with their direct testimony to the faith of their times. Thus, for example, Origen and Jerome had scientific doubts in regard to several of the Canonical Scriptures, but, seeing that these were generally accepted, they made no objection to their being used in the Church. And many Traditions have fared in the same way. A long time was needed before certain truths and institutions were scientifically and speculatively understood, as Augustine remarks *apropos* of hereti-

108 *De Div. Quaest.* Opp. xi. 351. Kraus, *Real-Encyclop.* i. 175.

cal baptism ; but the general faith and usage of the Church were independent of such considerations.

The attitude taken up by the Fathers towards Infant Baptism is brought forward as a case in point. Tertullian, on the one hand, disapproved of Infant Baptism out of respect for the sacred action ; he cannot, therefore, have declared it to be an Apostolic Tradition ;[109] but, on the other, it is clear from his treatise that Infant Baptism was, in his time, very widely practised. Moreover, he enjoins that the Sacrament should not be conferred hurriedly either on adults or children. For even in the latter case, the god-parents are often unable to give security for the children being brought up as Christians. Nevertheless this is quite consistent with his viewing Infant Baptism as an Apostolic Tradition ; although he assigned to it no exclusive character, as was usual in adult baptism. Even in the days of Irenæus and Tertullian, Infant Baptism was justified by an appeal to Matth. XIX. 14, and had obtained wide acceptance. In the third century[110] the practice of baptizing the children of Christian parents was generally received. And so no other course is open but to set it down as an Apostolic Tradition, an explanation which Tertullian does not dispute. Origen, too, in so many words, explains Infant Baptism as one of the customs handed down from the Apostles. Still it was not looked upon as a rigidly exclusive Tradition, else many children of Christian parents would not have grown up unbaptized. Only by reason of imminent danger were the faithful constantly exhorted not to defer baptism too long. The Council of Trent was the first to issue a dogmatic decree regarding the validity of Infant Baptism, and, at the same time, it enacted disciplinary regulations concerning it. Here, too, we see that development has taken its ordinary course. Our Lord gave utterance to the dogmatic thought underlying the whole ques-

109 Hase, p. 72. Tertull., *De Bapt.* c. 18. *De Anima*, c. 39, 40.

110 Harnack, p. 358. Hefele, i. 115. Hergenröther, i. 264. Iren., ii. 22, 4 ; v. 15, 3. Orig. *In. Ep. ad Rom.* v. 9. *In Levit. Homil.* 8, 3. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. vii. De Bapt. can. 12. 13.

tion, viz.: that baptism is necessary for all men unto salvation. The universal practice of Infant Baptism, which cannot be proved to have been instituted by the Church,[111] points to its Apostolic origin. The position taken up by the Fathers at different times proves that Infant Baptism, though not absolutely binding, was considered most desirable. Finally, the Council of Trent drew the necessary conclusion from the whole course of development that the question had undergone.

53.* Tradition and development go hand in hand. The former cannot be rightly understood without the latter. Then, again, Tradition, as the Church understands the term, is a complex institution. Like the Church herself, it consists of a human and a divine element. In one sense it is all human, in another it is all divine. Ever since the word of God has become human faith, says Möhler, it has become subject to the condition and fortune of human ways. It is announced in human language, assimilated by the human mind, preserved and transmitted by human means. But then there is along with it the *charisma veritatis*, the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the Apostolic succession, by which the word of God is safeguarded against human error and corruption. The Spirit of truth that lives in the Church, is not merely that "higher and refined historical sense," claimed by Protestant science, but it is the very Spirit of God.[112] To say that the Catholic Church appeals to tradition and Scripture, either because she dreads the spectre of innovation, or because she does not feel perfect confidence in her infallibility, betrays woeful ignorance of the nature and character of Tradition, and of the whole genius of the Church. Had all her doctrines of faith been formulated and fully expressed from the beginning—if that were possible—there would be no intellectual life of faith in the Church, no development, no progress, nor growth

111 Aug. *De Bapt.* iv. 23, 30; xxiv. 31. *Genes ad. lit.* x. 23, 30. *Sermo*, 174, 9. *De Lib. Arbit.* iii. 20, 67. See Klee, Dogmatik, iii. 152.

112 Hase, p. 79.

in spiritual knowledge. But if there was to be an ever-flowing stream of mental activity, of growth and progress in the knowledge of God's word, a real life of faith, then the divine Spirit Himself had to direct its course, and to strengthen the banks of the channel in which it flowed.

54.* Protestant writers are wont to quote such doctrines as the seven Sacraments, indulgences, Purgatory, celibacy, auricular confession, communion under one kind, Papal infallibility, Immaculate Conception, as doctrines in which the principle of Tradition completely breaks down. With the same right they might quote the definitions of Nicæa, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, as the heretics of that time actually did. But they forget the doctrine of development. They seek formal and explicit testimonies when there are only implicit. This is the radical fault of the so-called historical school as opposed to the dogmatic principle of Tradition. How effective, for instance, in the eyes of those who do not understand Catholic Tradition and development, is the phalanx, when properly marshalled, of mediæval opposition to the Immaculate Conception! Yet to those who know what Tradition and development are, this appears for the time being but the natural and necessary result of both. Need we remark once more that only the consentient and final testimony of the Apostolic succession, that is, of Bishops in union with the Apostolic See, is infallible, and that, consequently, until that testimony exists and is clearly brought home to the children of the Church, they are free to form their own opinion, each one according to his light, and according to approved methods of theology? Unless Protestants can prove that these opponents of the doctrine were not ready to yield to the final decision or testimony of the Apostolic succession, or, again, that the doctrine is in no way implicitly contained in the position attributed to Mary in the early ages, the lance they point at Catholic Tradition will break harmless in their hands. Their objection will ever be beating the air, as it does when they object that the Church, at times, rests her claims upon

spurious documents. Such, for instance, were the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which, for a long time, were quoted as genuine documents of Tradition. But did the faith, to which these documents gave external expression, originate with them, or was it already in existence? Or, again, did the Church rest her claims upon them alone? These questions, and these only, are to the point.

55.* In the next place, the two-fold character of Catholic Tradition must be borne in mind, when the testimony of antiquity or a traditional proof for a doctrine is sought. The witnesses are not all alike, nor of the same authority. The bishops of the Church, as we have seen, besides being supernaturally qualified, have received an official and divine appointment to bear witness to the deposit of faith. Their testimony, not in their individual capacity, but as representatives of the Apostolic succession, is authoritative and infallible. The testimony of other ecclesiastical writers, not bishops, possesses only a human and historical authority. Again there is a considerable difference in the value of the mere human authority of all these witnesses, whether bishops or others, according as they persevered in the unity of the Church or not; according as their works are expressly or tacitly approved or censured. The ecclesiastical position of the witnesses, as S. Vincent and S. Augustine have already pointed out, is of the greatest importance. So again, the solid and definite testimony to the belief of an age has to be distinguished from private views, speculations, hazards and opinions. Hence great discrimination and care are required in the student who sifts the evidence of tradition for himself, and endeavours to form a proper estimate of the traditional proof offered by the Church. If the above canons and rules which spring from the very nature and character of Catholic Tradition, are remembered, it will not be difficult to understand why the authority attaching in the Church to names like those of Origen, Tertullian, is very different; why Augustine wrote retractations; why, again, some views (opinions) more or

less common among the Fathers were afterwards abandoned, e.g. the doctrine of the Millenium, the Parousia, and others As the persons of the witnesses, so also the subject matter of their testimony differs. Hase thinks it ominous that the best names among the Fathers, those, too, who have done most for the development of Catholic truth and science, fell into bad repute and were more or less tainted with heresy.[113] But the reason is plain. The Church knows how to distinguish between personal views or speculative opinions, and the testimony to the common faith.

56. For the rest, the systematized body of Catholic doctrines, as it now stands, has nothing to fear from the closest scrutiny of antiquity. The edifice of Catholic belief is even now what it was in the days of the great Fathers and ecclesiastical writers. Both the Latin and Greek Fathers bear unanimous witness not only to the principle of Tradition, as the infallible rule of faith, but also to the contents of Tradition. This fact the Reformers themselves were obliged to recognize. How the case is altered with their doctrine of justification by faith alone! The Theologians of Rostock declare: As regards the articles on free will, grace and justification, orthodox antiquity is in complete agreement with Catholic Theologians.[114] Kepler, speaking of the doctrine of ubiquity, says that in reading the Jesuit Gretser's book against Wegelin, he felt in his heart the great weight that attaches to antiquity. He further confesses that the more he read of the ancients, the more he was convinced that the new Church is not in harmony with the old.[115]

57. The conclusion of this lengthy chapter is now in sight. The historical and scientific proof for Tradition is a necessary postulate of the infallible magisterium of the Church. *Nihil nisi quod traditum est*, is the fundamental statute law of the Church. It is an essential condition of the Church's teaching,

113 Hase, p. 73. Note 33. See Perrone, iii. S. 350. Zöckler, ii. 314.
114 Döllinger, *Kirche*, p. 435.
115 Opp. viii. 794. 864.

but for all that it is not the rule of faith, nor a substitute for the living authoritative teaching of the Church. It cannot produce supernatural faith. For, this requires the internal grace of God and the external infallible authority of the Church. The final and decisive word as to what belongs to Tradition, is and must be with the Church. Such is the doctrine of the *Vatican Council.*[116] It declares that Tradition is a necessary element in her divine magisterium. "And the Roman Pontiffs, "according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, "*sometimes assembling œcumenical Councils*, or *asking for the "mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by "particular synods, sometimes using other helps* which Divine "Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which "with the help of God they have recognized as conformable "to the sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the "Holy Spirit was promised to the successors of Peter not that "by His Revelation they might make known new doctrine, but "that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faith-"fully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered "through the Apostles." . . . . In a previous chapter it had said: "Further all those things are to be believed with "divine and Catholic Faith which are contained in the Word "of God, *written or handed down*, and which the Church, *either "by a solemn judgment*, or *by her ordinary and universal magis-"terium*, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed." It then goes on to say that faith as an inward act of the soul of man, requires a thoroughly reliable and reasonable basis, and that such a basis is the Church, but yet only the Church Catholic. "And that we may be able to satisfy the obligation "of embracing the true faith, and of constantly persevering in it, "God has instituted the Church through His only-begotten "Son, and has bestowed on it manifest notes of that institution "that it may be recognized by all men as the guardian and

116 *Const. Dogm. De Fide.* cap. i.-iii. *De Eccl.* cap. iv. (Card. Manning's translation).

"teacher of the revealed Word; for to the Catholic Church "alone belong all those many and admirable tokens which "have been divinely established for the evident credibility "of the Christian Faith. Nay, more, the Church by it-"self, with its marvellous extension, its eminent holiness, "and its inexhaustible fruitfulness in every good thing, "with its Catholic unity and its visible stability, is a great "and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable "witness of its own divine mission."

58.† In confirmation of the words of the Vatican Council as well as in illustration of the whole subject matter of Tradition, development, and authority, we cannot do better than quote the following remarkable passage from the writings of a keen Protestant thinker. Speaking of the Oxford movement in one of his theological essays, Mr. R. H. Hutton says: "Suddenly there rose up, on the "chosen ground of classical learning and among the ablest "thinkers of the day, a rumour that Protestantism was "reaping what it had not sown—that it could not have "originated the faith which it had inherited. Restless, "scrupulous, self-tasking, reasoning, subtle-minded men "affirmed that, though the tendencies of their whole nature "seemed to converge upon the Christian Revelation as the "very focus of their highest needs, yet that they could "never have accepted its facts as their highest certainty "without a constantly renewed testimony from an author-"ity above that of individual conviction. They were "sure that it was easier to recognize a divine authority "than to grasp or compass for themselves divine truth. "They thought they could perceive whom they ought to "obey, far more easily than what they ought to believe. "And they maintained, too, that the power to obey must "be granted first, as the simpler and most practical neces-"sity of life, and that it would draw after it the fullness "of belief. . . . And then there grew upon them, more "and more powerfully, the fascination of that mighty pow-"er, who through the march of centuries had advanced

"with a measured tread of her own, unborrowed from her "children—a step of which every footfall was a fiat, and "the rhythm a faith. It was obviously easy to throw a "temporary spell over minds in such a mood; but what is "the charm which has power to retain them, after experi- "ence of Rome's coarse splendours, and of her vigilant "and oppressive rule?

"Rome alone has presented her theology to the world "in a thoroughly institutional form. What Protestants "believe, Rome embodies in a visible organism. While "they derive the life of the Church from their faith, Rome "derives her faith from the life of the Church. Roman- "ism was a vast organisation almost before it was a dis- "tinct faith. Rome did not so much incarnate her dog- "mas in her ritual as distil her dogmas out of her ritual. "She had, indeed, knitted in with her spiritual agency "many an act both of conscious and unconscious faith; "she had built up her great missionary system on many "assumptions both of truth and duty; but, on the whole, "she acted before she thought, and interpreted her faith "under the inspirations of her achievements. Her theol- "ogy flashed upon her, as it were, as she beheld the eccle- "siastical form and order which was growing up out of "her unconscious energy. She solved the mystery of her "own success by believing that her institutions were even "fuller of the divine power than her thought, that she "could more easily draw God down into the bosom of the "Church by her life, than she could lift up the Church to "God by her meditation. Wherever the drift of Christian "practice seemed to point towards the development of the "Church's influence, there was a hint which she followed "up eagerly to its limits, as the directing finger of a divine "hand. And then contemplating her own fresh conquests "from a heathen world, under the inspiring consciousness "of being set to guide the mightiest and holiest of the "world's forces, she did not hesitate to affirm that God "was in her institutions, that He was acting through her

"agency, that He was really placing His divine influences "at her disposal, and that in contemplating the orderly "system of ecclesiastical life which was rising under her "creating hand, she beheld the divine disposition of His "living power. Thus, for example, the Christian practice "of baptism was, in her hands, an agent of great social "influence; and as she witnessed its results in consecrat-"ing new multitudes to Christ, and was conscious that her "own faith grew in gazing at the act (instead of the virtue "of the act having arisen from her faith), she at once "affirmed that God had granted a mighty regenerating "power to her hand, which did not proceed from, but "afterwards passed into, her spirit; that a grace was grant-"ed to her institutions from which her faith was nourished.

"Again the words of the Last Supper enjoined, as she "supposed, the sacrifice of the mass. Eagerly Rome saw "and used the mighty social influence of that divine insti-"tution. But here again she seemed to gather faith "from the power of the rite. She administered it in weak-"ness and yet she was the almoner of power; the faith was "multiplied in the giving, so that while it seemed too lit-"tle for a few, it fed multitudes, and she gathered up more "than she divided; it seemed that no virtue went out of "her, yet richly it streamed in; in the act itself was the "birth of faith; the power of God was in the elements "themselves, for the grace and peace, which had not passed "through the spirit of the Church, returned upon her: "and so she gazed till she could see the bread and wine no "longer, though their external qualities remained; the es-"sence was transmuted before her eyes into the life of Him "who first consecrated them; the outward signs were but "transparencies through which the living glory gleamed; "that seeming film of physical quality held fast the very "presence of the Eternal, and God was perfectly blended "with that sign of Himself which He had chosen."[117]

117 *Essays Theological and Literary*. Vol. I. p. 335.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PRIMACY OF S. PETER.

1. The marks and properties of the Church have from time to time brought into view its visible point of unity. For, in the last resort, the Apostolicity insisted on by Irenæus and Tertullian has its basis in the Roman Church. Without a visible centre, Unity and Catholicity have no *point d'appui*. Infallibility requires an united organization with a head. Christ is, indeed, the invisible head of the Church ;* but since He constituted His Church a visible society, a visible body, He must have placed over it a visible head. And as He expressly enjoins unity between Church and flock, He must have made provision for unity in the pastoral office.†

* The above expression is, sometimes, misunderstood. It may mean that Christ is the head of the invisible Church, that is, the whole gathering of those who are in a state either of grace or glory. The souls of all the just stand in the same relation to Christ, as the members of the body to the head. Of this headship of Christ Catholic Theology treats under the title *De gratia capitis Christi*. See S. Thomas, III. q. 8. a. 1-8. But when the phrase has reference to the visible Church on earth, its meaning is very different. Christ is the invisible head of the visible Church, not only because He is its head in so far as it is a portion of the invisible Church, but because He who is the visible head is Christ's vicar an representative; just as each bishop and each priest is but a representative of Christ, *the* bishop of our souls, and *the* only eternal priest. In this sense, then, there is no head, no bishop, no priest in the Church but Christ. Thus the assertion of a visible [vicarious] head, far from being a denial, is, on the contrary, the strongest assertion of Christ's invisible headship, just as the existence of visible bishops and priests is the best proof of Christ's continued episcopate and priesthood on earth. *Tr.*

† As Christ began the visible Church by collecting round Himself disciples, whom, as their visible head, bishop, and priest, He ruled and guided, led and sanctified, the antecedent probability, not to say necessity, for a vicarious head after His departure from earth, becomes immense, quite independently of the overwhelming direct evidence from Scripture given by the author in the following paragraphs. Here we may notice that Anglican divines can, when they choose, be very keen on the argument from antecedent probability. Thus the writer of the essay on the

2. We gather from Holy Scripture that our Lord assigned to one of the twelve a pre-eminent position, and conferred on him exceptional power. This one was S. Peter. The first time that we meet him, he was one of the Baptist's disciples. After Andrew, in company with John, had come to know Him whom the Baptist had pointed out to his disciples, he said to his brother Simon : " We have found the Messias, which is, " being interpreted, Christ." And forthwith Andrew introduced his brother to Jesus. " And Jesus " *looking upon* him said : Thou art Simon the son of Jonas ; " thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter" (John I. 42. 43). Whether the *future* be taken as such, or as a Hebrew mode of making a categorical statement, in either case it answers perfectly to the picture of Jesus as sketched by John. Straightway, at the first meeting, He bestows on Peter a name descriptive of his future office. In scanning his character Jesus discerned in him a fitting instrument for His Church.

This meeting, preparatory to Peter's call to the Apostleship formed the foundation of the relations that were henceforward to subsist between him and Jesus. " And " Jesus walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, " Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, " casting a net into the sea (for they were fishers). And " he saith to them : Come ye after me, and I will make " you to be fishers of men. And they immediately leaving " their nets followed Him."[1] Luke relates the incident in his own peculiar sententious way : Jesus seeing two ships

Church in *Lux Mundi* uses it with great adroitness and force in proving that Christ must have instituted (1) a Church or visible society, (2) with visible government and priesthood, (3) with visible unity through the historic succession of the Episcopate. But, strange to stay, his hand suddenly loses its cunning, and he stops short in face of the question of a visible centre of that unity. He dismisses the question with the offhand remark : " The Roman Church has added to it what seemed a further safeguard of unity, the test of communion with itself ; (?) but this was a later claim, a claim which was persistently resented, and which was urged with disastrous result." (P. 380-381). And, stranger still, of the entire evidence of Scripture as to the Primacy of S. Peter there is not a word in the whole essay ; as if our Lord's dealings with S. Peter had no bearing whatever upon the organization of the Church ! *Tr.*

1 Matth. iv. 18. 19. Mark i. 16. 17. Luke v. 1 seq.

standing by the Lake of Genesareth went into one that was Simon's, and desired him to draw back a little from the land. And He taught the multitude from the ship. "When "He had ceased to speak, He said to Simon: Launch out "into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. "And Simon answering said to Him: Master, we have "laboured all the night and have taken nothing; but at "thy word I will let down the net. And when they had "done this, they enclosed a very great multitude of fishes, "and their net broke . . . Which when Simon Peter "saw, he fell down at Jesus' knees saying: Depart from "me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord . . . And Jesus saith "to Simon: Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch "men. And having brought their ships to land, leaving "all things, they followed Him" (Luke v. 1 seq.).

3. This is not the place to discuss the relation in which S. Luke's narrative stands to the others. The Fathers halt between identification and separation. From Augustine to Toletus the narratives were set down as distinct. Modern commentators, since the days of Luke of Bruges, are almost unanimous in identifying the two. Some cut it into two, or distinguish two acts in the drama. The differences are so numerous that Luke's account can hardly be regarded as an enlargement of that given by Matthew and Mark. The march of events, and the entire situation are different. It is not at all improbable that the disciples, after their vocation, from time to time, plied their trade. And as Jesus was fond of walking by the lake, such scenes were very natural. As Luke's narrative implies that the disciples were acquainted with our Lord, it must be set down as the more recent.

Why, it may be asked, has Luke drawn the narrative with such minuteness of detail? The answer must be sought in Peter's subsequent conduct; in the whole character of S. Luke's Gospel; and in the veneration for the person of Peter, who is the chief figure in the first part of the Acts. In S. Paul's Epistles, too, he stands out as the

recognized head of those Apostles for whom Christ had shewn a preference. S. Luke wished to mark the significant bearing this incident had on the position of Peter in the Apostolic College. For this reason the narrative was not infrequently explained symbolically. For it was from Peter's ship that the net was launched for a rich capture. It would have been almost broken, had not his companions come to his aid. And thus Peter holds the foremost place in the ship, which is the Church. He it is who must first let down the net. To him, before all others, apply the words: "Thou shalt catch men." The others are his helpmates, and in conjunction with him, people and fill the Church with those who confess Christ. Peter's Church is the Church of Christ. The ship, in which Peter is, is the Noe's Ark in which the faithful are saved.[2]

4. When we look more closely into the position that Peter forthwith assumed in the Apostolic College, we see that he was one of the few to whom preference was shewn, and that among these he was the first. After the very first appearance in the Synagogue at Capharnaum, Jesus went to Peter's house, and healed his mother-in-law who was sick of a fever. (Matth. VIII. 14). And after He had gone away, "Simon and they that were with him followed after "Him." (Matth. I. 36). Not merely does Peter always head the list of the Apostles,[3] but he is also expressly described as the first (Matth. x. 2). The Synoptists, too, give special prominence to the name Peter. Mark interrupts the course of his narrative to observe: "To Simon "He gave the name Peter." (III. 16). Peter, James and John were the only three privileged to witness the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Mark v. 37, 43). When Jesus walking upon the sea came to the Disciples, it was Peter who jumped down into the water from the boat to go and meet Him. (Matth. XIV. 28, seq.) It was Peter, again, who asked our Lord to expound the parable concerning outward and inward purity. (xv. 15.)

2 Maxim. Tur., *Sermo* 114. Arnob., *in Psalm*, 106.
3 Matth. x. 2. Mark iii. 17, 18. Luke vi. 14, 15. Acts i. 13.

5. After Christ's memorable discourse in the Synagogue at Capharnaum, many of the Disciples went away, and walked no more with Him, because they found His doctrines hard to believe. "Then Jesus said to the twelve: "Will you also go away. And Simon Peter answered "Him: Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the "words of eternal life." (John VI. 67, seq.) This incident is closely bound up with the confession that S. Peter made, when our Lord asked the Disciples whom they took Him to be: "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God." (Matth. XVI. 16.) To appraise at its full worth this confession, so public and so unambiguous, we must accurately weigh the circumstances. The Apostles had, indeed, seen the miracles that Jesus had wrought, and had listened to His exalted teaching. But what a forest of prejudice had to be cut down before they could persuade themselves that He who stood before them in the simple guise of a man was the Messias, whose coming the prophets had painted in such dazzling colours! before they would reconcile themselves to honour the true Son of God with the same faith as they honoured the one God, Jahve. Nor was the hostile attitude assumed by the Jewish scribes and doctors calculated to develop such faith.

Once, indeed, the Apostles, carried away with astonishment at Christ's wondrous miracles, had fallen at His feet exclaiming: "Indeed, thou art the Son of God." (Matth. XIV. 23). But now, it was a question of uttering, with calm, deliberate reflexion, the confession that was to be decisive for the future. And for Peter, the mouthpiece of the Apostles, as Chrysostom calls him, the task was reserved. Peter sealed the faith of the Apostles with the clear, precise formula in which he gave in his full adhesion to Jesus as the Messias and Son of God. And Jesus Himself recognized the importance and far-reaching significance of the step taken by the first of the Apostles. For he appealed to divine revelation as the only possible source of faith so far removed from all human and natural motives. "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona," said our Lord, "be-

"cause flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my "Father who is in heaven." Whence it follows that Peter, though speaking in the name of all, as the Fathers generally assumed,* was also making his own profession of faith.[4]

Shortly afterwards, when our Lord foretold His coming passion to the disciples for the first time, "Peter taking "Him began to rebuke Him saying: Lord, be it far from "Thee, this shall not be unto Thee." (Matth. XVI. 22). And turning to Peter, our Lord said: "Go behind me, "Satan, thou art a scandal unto me: because thou savour-"est not the things that are of God, but the things that are "of men." Even the sharp rebuke itself serves to bring out in bold relief Peter's prominent position.

6. At the Transfiguration, Peter is again to the fore (Matth. XVII. 1). In his rash impetuosity he proposes to build three tabernacles on the Mount. And when Jesus had returned with His disciples to Capernaum, "they that "received the didrachmas came to Peter and said: Doth "not your master pay the didrachmas?" (Matth. XVII. 24). And Peter quickly answered: Yes. After telling Peter that He and His disciples were, properly speaking, free, Christ said: "But that we may not scandalize them, "go to the sea, and cast in a hook; and that fish which "shall first come up take; and when thou hast opened its "mouth, thou shalt find a starter; take that, and give it "to them for me and thee." And when Jesus had discoursed on fraternal correction, Peter came unto Him and asked, how often he should forgive his offending brother (XVIII. 21). After our Lord's interview with the rich young man, it was Peter again who put the question: "Behold "we have left all things and have followed thee: what "therefore shall we have?" (XIX. 27).

In the history of the Passion, too, Peter plays a chief role.

4 See Bonavent., *Expos. in Luc.* ix. 20. Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, ii. 99.

* A much more correct way of putting it, would be to say that the other Apostles appropriated to themselves and made their own the confession which Peter made of the divinity of Christ. Tr.

On seeing the whithered fig tree, he reminds our Lord how His curse had taken effect (Mark XI. 21). On the Mount of Olives, Peter, along with James and John and Andrew, questions our Lord as to the fate awaiting the temple (XIII. 3). At the washing of the feet Peter was unwilling to allow our Lord to perform such an act of humility to him (John XIII. 6). On bearing, however, that unless this were done he could have no part with Jesus, he forthwith exclaimed: "Lord, not only my "feet, but also my hands and my head." At the Supper itself it was indeed the beloved disciple that leaned on the bosom of Jesus, but the eager and impulsive Peter, who was close to him, beckoned to him to ask Jesus of whom He was speaking as the traitor (John XIII. 24). In the farewell discourse, again, Peter is the first to ask our Lord whither He was going (John XIII. 36). The prediction that they would all be scandalized, provokes from Peter the rejoinder: "Allthough all shall be scandalized "in Thee, I will never be scandalized (Matth. XXVI. 33). Nor could the prediction of his own fall repress his intense affection, and, as he thought, unswerving attachment. "Yea, though I "should die with Thee, I will not deny Thee." Jesus, however, in mitigation of that fall adds: "Simon, Simon, behold satan "hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou being "once converted confirm thy brethren" (Luke XXII. 31. 32). Peter and the two sons of Zebedee are privileged to accompany the Saviour to the garden of Gethsemani, and to witness the deepest depths of His sorrow. It was to Peter that Jesus addressed the gentle rebuke: Simon sleepest thou? A little later Peter draws his sword in defence of his Master (John XVIII. 10). He too, accompanied by one other disciple, (John XVIII. 15) follows Him from afar, while the others fled (Luke XXII. 54. He enters the court of the High-priest, where his faith and love encounter a terrible trial. His courage fails,[5] and he denies his Master. Jesus looks upon him, and he forth

5 Aug., *De Mend.* c. 6. Prudentius, *Cath.* I. 57.

with begins his course of life-long penance (Luke XXII. 61. 62). The lesson is learnt. The rock of the Church was to combine outward confession with inward faith; but both are the gratuitous gift of God. All the Evangelists mention Peter's fall and humiliation. Why?

7. The first message of the Risen Saviour sent by the angel is: "But go, tell His disciples and Peter that He "goeth before you into Galilee." (Mark XVI. 7). The women hasten to Simon Peter and the other disciples to inform them that the tomb is empty. Peter and the other disciple go out to see. John runs and arrives sooner than Peter, but the latter enters the sepulchre first (John XX. 2 seq.) The Risen Saviour Himself appears first to Peter (Luke XXIV. 34; I Cor. XV. 5). "After this Jesus shewed "Himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias. "And He shewed Himself after this manner: There were "together Simon Peter and Thomas . . . Simon Peter "saith to them: I go a fishing . . . That disciple, "therefore, whom Jesus loved, said to Peter: It is the "Lord. Simon Peter when he heard it was the Lord, girt "his coat about him (for he was naked) and cast himself "into the sea . . . Simon Peter went up and drew up "the net to land, full of great fishes." Then follows that scene of inexpressible tenderness, beauty, and grandeur, the threefold act of love and humility together with the thrice repeated charge to feed His sheep and His lambs. Finally Christ foretells by what death Peter was to die. (John XXI. 1-19). Commenting upon these facts S. Chrysostom[6] remarks: "Why was He not seen of all at the same "time? That He might first sow the seeds of faith. For "he that saw Him first, and was exactly and fully assured, "told it unto the residue; then their report coming first, "placed the nearest in expectation of this great wonder "and made way before the faith of sight. Therefore "neither was He seen by all together, nor in the beginning "by more in number, but by one alone first, and him the "leader of the whole company, and the most faithful;

6 Chrysost., *In I Cor. Homil.* xxxviii. 4. (Oxford Transl.)

"since indeed there was great need of a most faithful soul "to be first to receive this sight. For those who, after "others had seen and heard, got a sight by their means, "had in their testimony what contributed in no small de- "gree to their own faith, and tended to prepare their own "mind beforehand; but he who was first counted worthy "to see Him, had need, as I before said, of great faith, not "to be confounded by a sight so contrary to expectation. "Therefore He shows Himself to Peter first. For he that "first confessed Him to be Christ, was justly also counted "worthy first to behold His resurrection. And not on this "account alone doth He appear to Him first, but also be- "cause he had denied Him, more abundantly to comfort "him, and to signify that he is not abandoned, before the "rest He vouchsafed him even this sight, and to him first "entrusted His sheep. Therefore also He appeared to the "women first. Because this sex was made inferior, there- "fore both in His birth and in His resurrection this first "tastes of this grace. But after Peter, He is seen also of "each dispersedly, and at one time of fewer, at another of "more, thereby making them witnesses and teachers of "each other, and rendering His Apostles trustworthy in all "that they said."

To no other Apostle was his death and martyrdom foretold. Both the prediction and the manner of death (similar to our Lord's) constitute a particular Petrine privilege. And it is not the least remarkable circumstance, that the Gospel narrative closes with this announcement.

8. We have drawn a rapid sketch, from the four Evangelists, of the singular preference our Lord shewed for Peter. Each Gospel seems to view him in a different light. The first lays stress on his relation to Christ and the Church; the second has always been considered his own Gospel; the third brings out in relief his human weakness made strong by grace; the last shows him forth as the leader of his companions, as the humble, yet fiery Apostle. But all agree in the portrait they delineate of his charac-

ter, his virtues, and his faults. No one of the Apostles seemed to be better qualified to carry out the great work that Christ intended to commit to them. The reader of the Gospels cannot but feel drawn to Peter, whose soul is always on fire, whose heart is aglow with love,—a love quick and impulsive, like all human love, and yet courageous and daring, and large enough to conquer the whole world. Nor can the reader help compassionating him in his fall. The sight of the mighty oak bent by the storm fills him with sadness. And how he rejoices at seeing Peter rise again from his fall and receive the gracious pardon of his Lord and Master! And the joy in his heart mounts and swells when, once more, he beholds the grand figure again in his place at the head of the Apostolic College. Who does not feel a lively interest in the man whom Christ, at their very first meeting, designated a rock?—the rock on which the new world-wide city of God was to be built; the rock hewn by the hand of God, the rock that seemed for the moment to be beaten down and engulphed beneath the waves, but which now stands above the waves, firm and impregnable.

The incidents detailed in the foregoing pages, taken in their cumulative force, establish beyond cavil or question, that S. Peter held a prominent position among the Twelve, and that he was from the first the object of Christ's special care and affection. Let this prominent position be called, for argument's sake, a primacy of honour, anyhow it is a primacy. But the student of Scripture will hardly rest satisfied with the naked fact. He will naturally seek the cause and reason why. He will ask himself: For what purpose did Christ confer on Peter all this honour and preferment? He feels sure that there must be a natural way of accounting for it; a way that shall make all these details and all the texts of Scripture fit into a harmonious whole. To these special Petrine texts we will now direct our attention.

9. The first special passage that has to be considered, is

from Matthew XVI. 18-19: "*And I say to thee: That thou art* "*Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates* "*of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the* "*Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt* "*bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatso-* "*ever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*" These words were spoken to Peter immediately after he had received a special divine revelation to confess the divinity of Christ. The three Synoptists allude to the confession, but S. Matthew's account is more minute than that of the others, and he alone has recorded the great promise with which Christ rewarded Peter's Confession.

No passage is less open to criticism. It fits well into the plan and composition of the first Gospel, the scope of which is to prove to Jewish Christians from the prophecies that Christ is the Messias, the Son of God, and that the new kingdom is the Messianic kingdom. S. Matthew, therefore, had a special reason for entering in detail into the constitution, organism, and laws of the new kingdom, in order to contrast it with the old Theocracy. Over against the Decalogue he places the sermon on the Mount; the Apostles are the antithesis to the Prophets; the Church has taken the place of the Synagogue. To assert that the picture of the Church, as drawn by S. Matthew, with S. Peter at the head, is a product of a later age,[7] is to worship shadows and adore false shapes. Matthew's Gospel is the answer and the realization of ancient prophecy and Jewish expectations. Its scope and immediate purpose supply the natural explanation of its contents. Antiquity with one concerted voice assigns it the first place. The objection that it is only the later accounts which describe Peter as the type and representative of the community, or at least of the Apostles,[8]

7 Weisse, *Evangel. Geschichte*, ii. 93. Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, p. 246. *Jesus Nasarenus*, p. 144. Holtzmanna, *Bibel-Lexicon*, iv. 482. Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 193. Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*. p. 246. Against these, see Thoma, *Die Petrusbenennung*, (Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theol. 1875, p. 215.) Hilgenfeld, *ib.* 1877, p. 269.

8 Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen*, p. 75 Note 1. *Apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 392.

would, if it were true, be equally fatal to the modern critical view of the composition of the Gospels. For he is generally so represented in our Lord's discourses which the critics consider the oldest portions of S. Matthew's Gospel. On their own admission, therefore, S. Matthew's purpose was not to give undue prominence to Peter and his party, and set them on an artificial pedestal, but to tell the plain and simple truth that the new kingdom fulfilled the promises of the old law, and to show in what way it fulfilled them.

Why, then, it will be asked, have the other Evangelists omitted this important promise to S. Peter? From motives of simple prudence. It would have been ill advised and dangerous in the extreme to flourish the new religion before the heathen world as a compact, organized, and firmly established society. These reasons were less urgent in writings, but they were paramount in the oral instructions of the faithful. Hence, Mark, Peter's companion, is satisfied with merely hinting and alluding to his distinguished position. But an impartial examination of the account in the three Synoptists will show at once that S. Matthew's is the fullest. He gives the reason why Simon's name was changed to Peter; his purpose was to draw out the magnificent parallels between the old and new Theocracy.

10. As regards the interpretation of the passage, it is much easier now than in former days. The grammatical and historical interpretation is decisive and indisputable. It would be sheer waste of time and labour to refute seriously the pet evasions of Protestants of the old and new school.[9] "The promise," they say, "is not made to Peter personally, but to his faith subjective "and objective." But in the text the person is clearly addressed "Thou art Peter," and this name is meant to find its explantion in the following "and on this rock *(Petra)* I will build My "Church." *Petrus* and *Petra* are manifestly set one against the other, very clearly in Greek and Latin, on account of the different

[9] Holtzmann, *Zeitschrift, für wiss Theol.* 1878, p. 113.

termination of masculine and feminine; but less so in Aramaic, where the word *Kepha* is used in both cases. John retains the latter expression, and S. Paul, too, uses it by preference.[10] The Greeks usage of πέτρος in the sense of rock is not unknown. The copulative particle "and" [καὶ] as well as the demonstrative pronoun "upon *this* rock," establish the immediate connexion with the preceding subject "Peter." The natural and obvious sense being that Christ now assigns the reason why He had said at the very first meeting "thou shalt be called "Kepha (Peter)." "Thou art Peter, i.e., a man firm like a "rock; and upon this rock, i.e., firm foundation I will build "My Kahal or Church." No doubt this simple categorical statement will suggest many subordinate questions, as it may be regarded from several distinct points of view. Christ, as we all know, is the head and founder of the Church, and the foundation on which it is built. Christ's divinity, too, as is equally well known, is objectively the fundamental article of the edifice of Christian faith, and the belief in this article is the corner-stone in the subjective confession of faith. All these considerations help to explain *how* Peter is the rock of the Church, and *why* he was made the rock, but they are far from explaining away the fact that he is the rock. Why is he the rock? Because of the firm and unfaltering nature of his inward and outward confession of faith, the ultimate cause of which is to be sought, not in human nature, but in God's revelation. Then, again, since Peter is made a rock by Him who is *the* rock, he can only be a vicarious rock. When, therefore, the Fathers declare that Christ, or Christ's divinity, or faith in His divinity is the rock, their interpretations are quite correct; namely they are insisting on one or other of the points which are severally included in the full meaning of the text. In the language of Aristotle and S. Thomas, Peter is the *causa materialis*, his faith the *causa formalis*, Christ the *causa principalis and efficiens* of the rock. To urge one more than another is not to exclude the remainder.

10 John i. 42. I. Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix, 55; xv. 5. Gal. ii. 9. See also i, 18; ii. 11, 14.

It is to no purpose, therefore, to pile up quotations of these different (partial) interpretations of the Fathers and Schoolmen,[11-12] as the author of the *Smalkaldic* articles does.[13]

11. *Chrysostom* says: "Upon this rock, not upon Peter; for not upon a man, but upon the faith of Peter has He built His Church. And what faith was that? [It was] "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God."[14] *Hilary* says: "The Father revealed it to Peter so that "he could say: Thou art Christ the Son of the living "God. Upon the rock of this confession, therefore, rests "the edifice of the Church." Indeed the Fathers and older interpreters[15] frequently explain the rock of the faith of Peter, sometimes even of the faith of the believers in

11 Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Primasius, Cassiodorus, Gregory the Great, Ven. Bede, Peter Lombard, Glossa ordinaria. See Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, p. 40; ii. 9; iii. 11. *Kirchenväter*, p. 121.

12 On the Protestant interpretation, see Meyer *Comment. zu Matth.* Göttingen, 1876, p. 351. Ellicott, a New Testament Commentary, on Matth. xvi. 16. This Anglican Bishop and commentator is worth quoting at least *in terrorem*. He says: It is not easy, in dealing with a text which for many centuries (?) has been the subject-matter of endless controversies, to clear our minds of those "after-thoughts of theology" which have gathered round it, and, in part at least, overlaid its meaning. It is clear, however, that we can only reach the true meaning by putting those controversies aside, at all events till we have endeavoured to realise what thoughts the words at the time actually conveyed to those who heard them, and that when we have grasped that meaning, it will be our best preparation for determining what bearing they have upon the later controversies of ancient and modern times. And (1) it would seem clear that the connection between Peter and the rock . . . was meant to be brought into special prominence . . . (2) Whether he is to be identified with the rock of the next clause is, however, a question on which men may legitimately differ. [After saying that there is a probability for the affirmative and a possibility of the negative opinion, he continues] (3) on the assumption of a distinction there follows the question, What is the rock? Peter's faith (subjective)? or the truth (objective) which he confessed? or Christ Himself? Taking all the facts of the case, the balance seems to incline in favor of the last view. [Now follow the passages where Christ or God is called or compared to a rock, he then continues] As with the words which in their form present a parallel (?) to these, "Destroy this temple" (John ii. 19), so here we may believe the meaning to have been indicated by a significant look or gesture. The Rock on which the Church was to be built was Himself . . . Had Peter himself been meant, we may add, the Scripture form, "Thou art Peter and on thee I will build My Church," would have been clearer and more natural. As it is, the collocation suggests an implied contrast. "Thou art the Rock-Apostle; and yet not *the* Rock on which the Church is to be built. It is enough for thee to have found the Rock, and to have built on the one Foundation." And this passes for serious and sober exegesis! Tr.

13 *Artic. Smalc.* p. 345.

14 *In Matth.* Homil. 55. 83 (al. 54, 2; 82, 3). Hilar., *De Trinit.* vi. (36, 37).

15 Langen, *Unfehlb.* p. 38. ii. 19; iii. 24.

general[16]; but what follows from that? Nothing more than that the reason why Peter is the rock lies in his divine knowledge and his bold confession of revealed faith, especially of its fundamental article. We have but to read the whole context in order to see that, far from denying the Petrine privilege, they rather derive it from the words and their interpretation. Thus Hilary remarks, that while all the Apostles were silent, Peter, outstripping the measure of human weakness, recognized the Son by the revelation of the Father, and by confessing His divinity he acquired pre-eminent glory?

Origen has these words: "Peter upon whom the Church "of Christ is built, against which the gates of hell will not "prevail."[17]

Cyprian, likewise, calls the Church the mother, fountain, and root, which was first and by the word of the Lord alone built upon Peter! "Upon him alone does He build His "Church (to him alone does He commit His sheep to "feed)." "For to Peter, upon whom He built His Church, "whence also He instituted and showed forth the origin of "unity, He gave the guarantee that whatever He should "loose on earth, should also be loosed in heaven.'"[18] *Tertullian* before him, had asked the question: "Was anything "hidden from Peter, who is designated as the rock upon "which the Church is to be built?" It is needless to produce further testimonies,[19] as most impartial interpreters, even Protestants, are now agreed that the reference of the rock to Peter is undeniable. The younger Jansenius had already supplied the correct interpretation to our passage: "When some of the Fathers say that the faith or confes-

16 Orig., *In. Matth.* xii. 10, 11, 14. Cyrill. Hier., *Catech.* xi. 3, Procop., Maxim. Conf., Ambros., Cassiodor.

17 *In Joann.* v. 3. Cf. *In Matth.* xiii. 31. Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25, 8.

18 *De Exhort. Martyr.* c. 11. *De Unit.* c. 4. *Epist.* 73, 7; 40, 5. *De Hab. Virg.* c. 10. Tertull., *De Praescr.* c. 22.

19 Hilar., *In Matth.* xvi. n. 7. *Ps.* 131, 4. Hieron., *In. Matth.*, iii. 16. *Ep.* 41, 2. *Adv. Pelag.* i. 14. Aug., *Retract.* i. 21. Victor., *In Gal.* i. 18. Ambros., *De Fide*, iv. 56. *Ps.* 40, 30. *In Luc.* iv. 7. Leo M., *Sermo* 51, 1. Gregor M., *Ep.* vii. 40. Epiphan. *Haer*, 59, 7. 8. *Ancor.* c. 9. Cyrill., Alex., vi. 219. Gregor. Naz., *Orat.* 32, 18. See Langen, p. 51.

"sion of Peter was the rock, it is true in the causal, not "in the formal sense, since his faith was the meritorious "cause for which the Church was formally built upon S. "Peter; just as Jerome says in his 61st Epistle, that not "the body, but the faith of Peter walked upon the waters." Faith in the abstract, has no existence; it only exists in a living being. The Church is an edifice of living stones. And for this reason, the rock upon which it is built must be a living rock, not an abstract quantity, but a real, concrete being, a person with living faith.[20]

This may furnish an explanation of the choice of the two different terminations in the Greek and Latin, *Petrus* and *petra*. In the second clause—*super hanc petram*—chief stress is laid upon the firmness in the man Peter. The metaphor of the rock, as cause and symbol of firmness, is of biblical usage.[21] The same idea underlies the mountain, mount Zion, holy city on the mountain of the Lord. The custom of building temples upon a rock, and of having a sacred stone for an altar, is also known to the heathen.[22]

On the word "church" we have already commented in a preceding chapter. The expression was naturally suggested by the very circumstances of the situation. The attitude taken up by the Jews, especially the leaders of the Synagogue, had obliged our Lord to establish not only a new Israel, but a distinct and separate organization with a new faith, new worship, new government. It was self-evident to a Jew that no one but Jahve, or one sent by Him, could supplant the old theocracy that God had established through Moses. Hence when the moment had arrived for our Lord to tell the disciples of the impending rupture with the old Kahal (Mosaic church), He first asked them a question as to His personal character and office, and having obtained the full and clear confession of His divinity, He forthwith announced the fact of the foundation of

20 Simar, *Dogmatick*, p. 596. Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 31.
21 Ps. 26, (27) 5; 39, 3. Matth. vii. 24. Deut. xxxii. 4; xviii. 30. Zach. ix. 16. See Selbst, *Die Kirche*. p. 181.
22 Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, 2 ed. v. 99.

His Kahal or Church, wherein Peter was to hold the place of Moses.* This was necessary, moreover, in the interests of the disciples and of the future work of Christ, which was to be dependent on them. For His life was fast drawing to a close; already His path had begun to be darkened by the shadow of His passion and death. The small flock of little faith began to be troubled. "From "that time Jesus began to show to His disciples, that He "must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the "ancients and scribes and chief priests, and be put to "death, and the third day rise again." Christ's work was now secured; the new kingdom of God would continue, as it had begun. For Christ would leave Peter in His place, strong as a rock, as the visible centre of His Church or community, which at the time consisted mainly of the Apostles, and therefore Peter was to be to his brethren what Christ had been to them all. Thus both the grammatical and the historical interpretation of the text are too clear and natural to be disputed by any save those who are blinded with prejudice. To quote the words of a largely circulated Protestant commentary: "There is no doubt that the Pri-"macy among the Apostles is here conferred upon Peter, in "as much as Christ distinguishes him personally as the one "whose Apostolic work, in consequence of his eminent and "peculiar firmness of faith, will impart, humanly speaking, "the indispensable condition of strength and support to the "community that Christ founded and intended to spread "over the world."[23] Again, another Protestant speaks to this effect:[24] "In this he (Weiss) is right, that he rejects "all ancient and modern Protestant interpretations, and "refers the promise to the person of Peter, by whom the

23 Meyer, *in h.l.* Weiss, in *h.l.*

24 Holtzmann, *Zeitschrift*, etc. 1878, p. 393.

* The parallelism between Moses and Peter had clearly struck the early Christians, as we may see from the painting on a large glass plate discovered by Basilewsky in Dalmatia (*Illyricum*): "*Petrus virga percussit, fontes coeperunt currere,*" "Peter struck (the Rock) with the Rod, and the streams (of grace) began to flow." See *Roma Sotterranea*, by Northcote and Brownlow, Vol. II. p. 318. This is all the more remarkable as S. Paul (Hebr. x. 21) had compared Moses with Christ. *Tr.*

"continuance of the Church, humanly speaking [Matth. VII. 24 "25] is assured." There are many others, no doubt, who read it with different eyes; some even have a vision so keen and penetrating as to discern in our Lord's words a clear protest against the Papacy![25] How loath men are to wake up from flattering dreams, and to shake off familiar fancies!

12. It has also been maintained that Peter's Primacy extended no further than his own communion, i.e. the Jewish converts; in other words it was bounded by his Apostolic labours among the circumcision.[26] A most arbitrary limitation! As if the stability of a house were assured, by one portion, and that the lesser, resting on the rock while the larger was built on sand! Our Lord's words, we are quite aware, are only a metaphor, and metaphors cannot be stretched beyond their compass. Neither however, can they, if used at all, be inept and inapplicable. Now unless Christ meant that Peter is in the social structure of the Church what a foundation is to a building, the application in the present instance would be utterly absurd. Besides this, the above limitation is excluded by the words that follow. "*And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" Hades or hell, in the language of the Bible, is a strong place, a prison, through whose gate he who enters never returns.[27] The gate itself is the symbol of strength and power, (Is. XXIV. 12). Accordingly it might seem that the sense of our Lord's words is: So firm is the Church built on thee, that it is even stronger than the gates of hell. This would be, as it were, a first and immediate view: but on further consideration, we know that Hades is aggressive, that is, it pulls down and destroys all created things, in as much as nothing can resist the inevitable doom of dissolution. The Greek word κατισχύω —to master, overcome, speaks decidedly for this interpretation.

25 Grau, ap. Zöckler, i. 580.

26 Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 274. Langen, *Unfehl*, p. 13.

27 Canticl., viii. 6. Job, xi. 8· xxxviii. 17. Is. xxxviii. 10. lvii. 9. Ps. ix. 14. cvii. 18. Wisd. xvi. 13. Luke xvi. 23. Acts ii. 27. 31. Apoc. i. 18; xx. 13. Matth, xi. 23. Luke x. 15. For passages from Classics, see Sepp, v. 106.

Hades will irrevocably dissolve and devour everything except the Church, which will be able to withstand all the natural forces of dissolution. If this be so, it follows that no created power, whether visible and material, or invisible and spiritual, can ever destroy the Church built upon Peter. Hades, moreover, is the dark and gloomy abode of the lost spirits, or again where the damned are mightily tormented (Luc. XVI. 23), the *gehenna* of the New Testament. Hence the Fathers, in interpreting the words, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," had in view the attacks made by Satan, and the evil spirits on the work of Christ. And rightly so. For not only does the first interpretation we have given, imply this extension, but Christ constantly spoke of the prince of darkness whom He had encountered, at the beginning of His public life, as the great adversary of mankind and of Himself. And again (Luke XXII) He had said: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired you "to sift you as wheat." The Apostles, too, constantly warned the faithful against the powers of darkness (Ephes. VI. 12), and their adversary going about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (I Peter V. 8). Moreover, under the gates of hell, the fathers comprised every work and instrument of the devil, such as sins and sinners, heresies and heretics,[28] persecutors and so forth. But Christ, says S. Chrysostom, has made a fisherman stronger than any rock, has made the Church immovable amidst the angry waters, the opposing waves and fiery floods; and even were the whole world to fight against it, it will be impregnable against all assaults.

13.* Whatever particular interpretation the Fathers may give of the text, they are all agreed that the Church is founded

28 As to sins, Ambr., *In Luc.* vi. 99. As to Heresies, Epiph. xxx. 12; Lxxiv. 14; *Ancor.* c. 9. Theodor., Ep. 14. Max. Conf., *Ep.* 13. Joann. Damasc., *De recta Sent.* n. 4. *Homil. in Transfig.* n. 6. Cassian.. *De Incarn.* iii. 15. As tc persecutions, Chyrs., *Homil. in Hebr.* xxi. 3. *De Inscr. Act*, ii. 1. Cyrill. Alex. In *Zach.* xii. 9. Ambros., *In Bono Mort.* n. 56. As to sinners and heretics, Isidor. Pelus., *Epist.* i. 238. Leo. *Sermo.* Li. 1. *Ep.* x. 1. Primas., *Ad Apoc.* xxi. See Langen, *Kirchenväter*, p. 127. Schanz. *Comment. in Matth.* p. 378; *in Marc.* p. 278

upon S. Peter, and that it will consequently last to the end of time.[29] It would argue shortsightedness in the commentator, who would allow himself to be perplexed by the three statements (1) that Christ is the head and foundation of the Church,[30] (2) that Peter is the same, and (3) that all the Apostles are the foundation. [Eph. II. 20]. *Suo quisque modo:* Each one in his own way, is the plain and obvious answer. The Church is a complex and organic institution. There is no more opposition between Christ and the Apostles than there is between Christ and the Father. Christ is the author of divine truth and grace, the fountain and source of spiritual blessings. He was moreover the first visible teacher and dispenser of the same; the Apostles after Him are neither authors nor fountains, but channels and instruments of truth and grace, and they are certainly the visible teachers and dispensers of His truth and grace. At the head of the dispensers of the mysteries of God stands Peter. *S. Leo* the Great has well expressed it when he says: "Since I am the inviolable rock, and the "corner-stone which makes both one,—the foundation beside "which none can lay another, yet thou also art a rock, because "by My power thou receivest firmness, in order that by partici-"pation thou mayest have in common what, in respect of "power, is proper to Me."[31] The saying of *S. Augustine*, that the "Church is built upon a rock, whence Peter received his name," became the common property of after ages. *S. Gregory* the Great says: "For who does not know, that the "holy Church is built upon the firmness of the Apostle-prince, "who derived the strength of his spirit from his name;—for "he was called Peter by [Him who is] the Rock? To him "also the Word of truth said: To thee I will give the keys of "the kingdom of heaven. And, again: Simon, son of John, "lovest thou me? Feed my sheep." S Thomas also adopts the explanation of S. Leo: "Upon this rock, that is, Christ,

29 Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, ii. 42.

30 I Cor. iii. 11; x. 4. I Pet. ii. 4, 5.

31 *Sermo.* iv. 2. August., *In Joann.* Tract. 124. 5. Gregor. M., *Ep.* vii. 40. cf. vi 18.

"in order to have a foundation and to impart strength to her "that is built upon it; or, again, upon this rock, that is, upon "thee, because thou receivest from me [the power of] being a "rock. And as I am a rock, so I shall build on thee as a rock. "But how? Are both Christ and Peter the foundation? We "answer that Christ is the foundation of Himself, but Peter is "the foundation in as much as he has the confession of Christ "and is His representative." In this sense it may be admitted that the Patristic interpretation, according to which the rock is Christ, or faith in Christ, or Peter, the prince of the Apostles, the first confessor of this faith, was prevalent until the time of Innocent III.[32] But it in no way excludes the Primacy; rather it establishes and explains its various causes and relations. Christ, Peter, Peter's faith are essential and necessary elements of the Primacy.

14.* As regards the relation of Peter to the other Apostles, who are also called the foundation of the Church [Ephes. II. 20], it really explains itself. Peter is the rock and foundation, in as much as he is the Vicar of Christ, holds the power and authority of Christ, and is the chief dispenser of His mysteries. But the other Apostles receive power and authority in the same kingdom and from the same source (Matthew XVIII. 18. XXVIII. 19. John XX. 22. Acts I. 8). Now plain common sense will suggest that this further act of our Lord cannot have been meant to annul the other act whereby He clearly promised and conferred the Primacy on Peter (Matthew XVI. 16. Luke XXII. 22. John XXI. 15-17). The two acts must, if possible, be brought into harmony. Nor is this a difficult task. The question resolves itself into a very simple one: Does the Primacy of one admit of a share in its power by many? The answer cannot be doubtful. The Apostles, therefore, participated in the same power and authority which Peter received from Christ. The power and authority of Christ is one, as the truth and grace of Christ is one. It is communicable, but not divisible. It

32 Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, ii. 42.

would be divided if each Apostle had received supreme and universal, that is, absolutely independent power. But since they form an organic body with a head, it is only shared and communicated. And certainly the share of each is as complete as it can be short of the Primacy. They are, one and all, infallible organs and witnesses of revelation; each and all have universal jurisdiction; they had the power, and exercised it, of founding and governing Churches in different parts of the world, and of issuing commands in every particular Church, of ordaining and appointing bishops, whose jurisdiction should be limited to a definite place. Thus they all co-operated in the work of establishing the Apostolic Churches which, in their turn, became, in some sense, the pillars and foundations of other Churches. The word 'foundation' may be taken relatively or absolutely, and in the relative sense it admits of considerable elasticity. The Synagogue, for instance, and the Old Testament may be called the foundation of the Church, and S. Paul really calls them so in Ephes. II, where he says that the Church is founded upon the Apostles and *Prophets*.

15. Hitherto we have been considering only the first half of the great Petrine passage in S. Matthew. But there is yet another clause, not less important. Our Lord goes on to repeat and, as it were, explain the promise made under the metaphor of a rock by a new and distinct, and yet withal kindred figure of speech. "*And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of*" *heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be*" *bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on*" *earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*" This portion of the text is as certain critically as the preceding; nor is there any reason for separating the two portions from one another. The change of metaphor, as well as the new shading of language which it entails is easy and natural. To hand over the keys is a symbol of the delivery either of house or property itself,[33] or

33 Is. xxii. 22. Is. vi. 6. Luke xi. 52. Apoc. i. 18; iii. 7; ix. 1; xi. 1. As to the custom of other nations, see Sepp, v. c. 38; Klee, *Dogmatik* i. 116; Wiseman, *Lecture viii. on Catholic Church*, p. 270.

of power and government over house or town. Whoever holds the keys of a place is, for the time being, its master. It rests with him to permit or refuse access to it, to determine the internal arrangements, and to make provision for all its needs. Thus the bride, according to a Roman custom, received the keys of her husband's house the first time she entered it after her marriage. When, therefore our Lord uttered these words, He had in mind not a mere door-keeper, but the steward or administrator, the master and ruler.[34] Of course the idea of door-keeper (*janitor*) is included, and hence the ancients frequently style Peter a *janitor*.[35] But not every *janitor* is alike. Thus we see that the one metaphor completes and explains the other. The former describes the position in which Peter stands to the building as a whole, the latter his relation to each and all of the living stones of which the edifice is made up.

Peter has charge and care of all who take refuge in this house. And in it they dwell in perfect security and safety, for it stands upon a rock. On the phrase ' kingdom of heaven ' we have spoken at sufficient length in chapter II. The figure of the keys of God's kingdom is thoroughly biblical, as we may see both from the Old and New Testament, and especially from the Apocalypse. Peter, then, according to our Lord's words is to be the supreme ruler and head of the Church of Christ on earth. The *exercise* of the power of the keys is represented as an act of binding and loosing. This requires a word of explanation. It would appear that this phrase was in use at that time. Thus the Rabbis were said to bind and loose, in as much as they declared what was right or wrong, licit or illicit. Hence to bind was to forbid, to loose was to allow or permit. In this sense we read in S. Matthew [XXIII. 13] and S. Luke [XI. 52] that the Scribes and Pharisees and Lawyers have the key of knowledge, and shut the kingdom of heaven against men by misinterpreting the law, and mislead the people by

34 Luke xii. 52. I Cor. iv. 1. Tit. I. 7.

35 Aster., *Homil.* viii. Felix, *Ep.* iv. 5. See Langen, *Kirchenväter*, p. 132.

foisting on them precepts of men instead of preparing them for the Messianic kingdom.[36] Thus what the strict school of Shammai would bind, the laxer school of Hillel would loose. In Josephus,* too, there is a passage wherein he says of the Pharisees, that they knew how to insinuate themselves into the grace of Alexandra, and usurp all the power, so that they were able to banish or recall whomsoever they would, and to bind and loose as they pleased. According to this acceptation of the word, Peter would be a true and safe interpreter of God's word; he would have the true understanding of revelation, and the true faith, and be able to declare the same to all who wish to enter the kingdom of heaven; he would be, in a word, the *judex controversiarum*.[35]

16.* This interpretation, however, is far too narrow for the words of our text and its subject matter. And, indeed, in words of such vast importance as the present, we are justified in attaching full force to every word. Now our Lord says to Peter: (1) *Whatsoever* thou shalt bind or loose. This is an absolutely universal statement. (2) This binding and loosing is in the kingdom of heaven—i.e., the Church of the Messias; but here surely there are the treasures of grace as well as truth; consequently the Keys are not limited to the department of knowledge. (3) Then there is the further addition that it "shall be bound or loosed *in heaven*." What Peter binds and looses *on earth*, is, at the very same moment and by the very same act, ratified *in heaven*. But such an assurance will apply far better to his acts of ruling and governing than to his teaching which, since it is already divine truth, needs no special ratification. (4) Were the Keys limited to knowledge

35 Felix, *Epist. ii. ad Acac.*

36 See Schanz, *Commen. in Luc.* p. 338. Eucher., *Lib. Form.* c. 8. Max. Tur. *Homil.* 116.

* Joseph., Flav., *De Bell. Jud.* i. 5, 2. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm. in iv. Ev.* Ed. ii. p. 378. Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.* ii. p. 894. Sepp. *Leben Jesu*, v. 117. Passaglia remarks on the passage of Josephus: "Itaque δεῖν καὶ λύειν idem Josepho valet ac in consortium τῆς ἐξουσίας venire."

in this text, they would have to be so limited also in Matthew XVIII. 18, where the binding and loosing evidently refer to Church government. From these considerations we conclude that Christ promised Peter the power of binding and loosing whatsoever is to be bound and loosed in His new kingdom. He gives him to hold the Keys in the way He Himself, not the Pharisees, had held them. The *vincula* or ties, in a living spiritual society like the Christian, are naturally of a moral nature. There is *vinculum legis*, the tie of law, revealed truth holding the first place; *vinculum curpae*, the tie of sin and guilt; *vinculum poenae*, the tie of punishment. All these Peter can make or unmake. And when Peter imposes them, men must submit, because these ties are ratified in heaven. Peter opens and no one closes, he shuts and no man opens. He holds the Keys of the house of David.

From the earliest times this passage and the power of the keys have been applied to the forgiveness and retention of sins. It is so applied in the edict of Callistus. Tertullian, far from denying it, asserts in the teeth of his Montanism, that in his time it was considered to belong, not only to Peter, but to the whole Church.[36] The immediate reason for referring this passage to the forgiving and retaining of sins has to be sought, no doubt, in the parallel passages of Matthew XVIII. 18, and John x. 23; though the reference cannot be justified on biblical or philological grounds. For, in the first place, there is no mention of sins in this passage, and secondly, there is no warrant in biblical usage for the *binding*, though there is for the *loosing* of sins.[37] Still, by implication, all these powers are contained in the promise made to Peter that he should hold the Keys of the kingdom of heaven. The direct force and meaning of the words is, not merely that Peter is chief teacher of truth,[38]

36 *De Pud.* c. 21. Hagemann, *Röm. Kirche*, p. 54, 624. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 2. Orig., Chrysost., Hieron., Faust., Caesar., Euthym., Theoptyl. Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 342.

37 Is. xl. 2. Eccli. xxviii. 2. I Esdr. ix. 13.

38 Düsterdieck, Müller, Keil, and others. See Meyer, p. 353, Note 2.

or chief dispenser of the mysteries of the house of God,[39] but that he has supreme power to judge who are worthy and who are unworthy subjects, and to grant or refuse admittance to the kingdom of heaven accordingly [Bede]. In this sense we find the Keys used among the heathen as the symbol of the judge of the dead—e.g., Isis and Serapis, Pluto and Aeacus.[40]

17. Peter, therefore, has a threefold key: the key of knowledge, the key of jurisdiction, and the key of paradise. He teaches, he rules and governs, he sanctifies. To his teaching and ruling and judgment the faithful must submit, if they would be saved. This is the Primacy of S. Peter, as understood not only in the 13th century by the Schoolmen, but long before by the Fathers. Thus *S. Chrysostom* says: "To a mortal man has He (Christ) "given the power over everything that is in heaven, when "He gave him the keys. This (key-bearer) has extended "the Church everywhere upon the earth, and has made it "stronger than heaven."[41] *S. Augustine* says: "Thus "fares the Church by blessed hope in this troublesome "life: of which Church the Apostle Peter, by reason of the "Primacy of his Apostleship, is by figurative generality the "representative. For as it regards himself in his proper "person, by nature he was one man, by grace one Chris- "tian, by more abundant grace one and withal the chief "Apostle: but when it was said to him: To thee 'I will "give the keys, etc.,' he denoted the universal Church, "which in this world by diverse temptations, like as by "rains, floods, tempests, is shaken and falleth not, because "it is founded upon the rock, *super petram*, from which "Peter had his name. For it is not *a Petro petra*, but *Petrus* "*a petra* . . . just as Christ is not so called from Chris- "tian, but Christian from Christ . . . . For the rock "was Christ: upon which foundation Peter himself was

39 Ahrens, *Das Amt der Schlüssel* 1864. Döllinger, p. 31. Schegg, *in h.l.*
40 Sepp, v. 114.
41 *Homil. in Matth.* 54. 2.
42 *In Joann.* Tr. 124. 5. *In Ep. Joann. ad Parthos*, Tr. 10, 1. *De Unit.* c. 21, 60. *In Ps* 108, 1. *Sermo* 76, 1; 295, 2. *De Doctr. Christ.* i. 18.

"also built." In this passage the great Doctor expressly affirms the Primacy and chief Apostleship of Peter, while explaining at the same time that Peter is not the original and principal rock, but a vicarious rock, a rock not by nature but by grace. And when he says that in Peter the universal Church received the power of the keys, he means to assert the perpetuity of the keys. These are in the Church as founded upon the rock. For he continues thus: "The Church, therefore, which is founded in "Christ (as the natural and principal rock) did *in Peter* [as the "vicarious rock and by grace] receive from Him the keys of "the kingdom of heaven, that is the power of binding and "loosing sins." *Tertullian* had said the same thing before: "Remember that the Lord hath given the keys to Peter, and "through Peter to the Church." *S. Hilary* thus recapitulates the significance of the promise: "O happy thou that in re-"ceiving a new name wast made the foundation and rock of "the Church, and wast worthy of having the Church built upon "thee! Thou who wast to loose the bonds of hell, the gates "of tartarus, and every lock of sin! O happy door-keeper of "heaven, to whose will the keys of the eternal entrance were "committed, whose judgment on earth has, by anticipation, "force in heaven so that what is bound or loosed on earth, "obtains judicial force in heaven."[43] Yet Hilary has not forgotten the other Apostles. They also are the eyes and the light of the Church; they are the mediators and have the fulness of Christ's power. He saw no contradiction between the Primacy of Peter and the Apostolate of the others.

18.* On the strength of Matthew XVIII. 18 it is often argued that all the Apostles were promised exactly the same power as Peter in Matthew XVI. 17; the difference being no other than that it was promised to Peter first and singly. And this view is thought to derive confirmation from Matthew XXVIII. 18 seq., where all alike receive mission and power to teach and baptize

43 Tertull., *Ad Scap.* c. 10. Hilar., *In Matth.* c. 16. n. 7 *in Ps.* 131. n. 4. See Nirschl, *Patrologie*, ii. 92.

in the name of Christ. But we have already said the two promises of our Lord must and can be easily reconciled. Why should not S. Matthew's order be followed? He mentions first one great act, and then another, done by our Lord in the organization of His Church. Just as all the Apostles, in Christ's life-time, share in His mission and power, so, after His departure, they were all to have the fullest share in the power entrusted to Peter. The pretended parallelism between Matthew XVI. and XVIII. has no real existence. The two differ both in words and in matter. Our Lord does not promise the Apostles in so many words that they shall be the rock of the edifice, or have the keys of the kingdom. They are promised what occurs in the last clause of Matthew XVI 19,—what we have called the *exercise* of the power of the keys. They have, therefore, according to Christ's institution, authority and power in His Church founded upon the rock, Peter. In this way justice is done to both texts.* Looking at Matthew XVIII. solely from an exegetical point of view, we can only glean from it that the Apostles were to have authority in the Church, but how much and in what manner, whether in their corporate or individual capacity, it is impossible to infer from the passage by itself.† That each one shared in its plentitude, short of the Primacy, as

* On this subject, that is, the relation of the Apostles to Peter, and of Peter to Christ, S. Leo's commentary (Sermo ii.) will ever stand unsurpassed in its directness and simplicity. We quote it in the original: "Cum multo utilius multoque sit "dignius, ad beatissimi Petri apostoli gloriam contemplandam aciem mentis "attollere, et hunc diem in illius potissimum veneratione celebrare, qui ab ipso "omnium charismatum fonte tam copiosis est irrigationibus inundatus: *ut cum* "*multa solus acceperit, nihil in quenquam sine illius participatione transierit.* ". . . et tamen de toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum "gentium vocationi *et omnibus apostolis cunctisque ecclesiae patribus* praeponatur, ut quamvis in populo dei multi sacerdotes sint multique pastores, *omnes* "*tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus.* Magnum et "mirabile, dilectissimi, huic viro consortium potentiae suae tribuit divina dig- "natio: et si quid cum eo commune ceteris voluit esse principibus, nunquam nisi "per ipsum dedit, quidquid aliis non negavit." In some Editions this Sermon is marked as I.

† According to Ellicott (Comment. in h. l.) there is no authority whatever conferred upon the Apostles in this text. 'Tell the Church' means, appeal to public opinion, or, as society is now constituted, to the State. This, however, does not prevent him from urging the passage against the claim of Peter's Primacy! A more cynical interpretation of Holy Scripture, than that of chapters xvi. and xviii. of S Matthew by this Anglican Bishop, it would be difficult to imagine. Tr.

far as was necessary for the first foundation of the churches, we know from other passages of scripture. As each Apostle possessed the Apostolate in its perfection, the practical scope of the Primacy was naturally less than in Postapostolic times. Hence some of the Fathers say that all the Apostles were equal in power.[46]

S. Leo, the Great, in his second sermon speaks thus: "There remains firm, then, the disposition of truth, and S. "Peter has not abandoned that guidance of the Church, "which he had undertaken; he still perseveres in the firm-"ness he has received. He is preferred to the others inas-"much as he is called rock, and proclaimed to be the "foundation, and appointed doorkeeper of the kingdom "of heaven, and constituted judge with power of binding "and loosing, so that his judgment has force also in heav-"en. From the mystery of his names we may learn, how "close is his fellowship with Christ (*qualis ipsi cum Christo* "*esset societas*). He (Peter) is now discharging his duty "with greater fulness and power (*plenius et potentius*). And "with Him, by whom he was glorified, he discharges every "part of the duties of his office. If therefore anything is "done well by us, or any matter judged aright, or any-"thing obtained from God's mercy by our daily supplica-"tions, it is (really) due to the work and merits of him, in "whose chair his power lives, and his authority shines."

So, again, when the Fathers appeal, as they do at times, to Matthew XVI. in order to prove the Apostolic succession or the institution of the Episcopal power in general, they have no intention of denying the Primacy; but, like S. Cyprian, they view it as *the* one and indivisible power of Christ, shared and participated in by many, that are one body; and they are one body by means of their head. This was the reason, as Cyprian argues, why Christ gave His power first to one and then to others, to show that it makes for unity and not for division. Unity begins with one. The Primacy of Peter and its per-

46 Cypr., *De Unit.* c. 4. *Ep.* 70, 3. Hieron. *Adv. Jov.* i. 14.

petuity, as Catholics have urged since the days of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Leo, down to the Vatican Council, is the guarantee not only of the faith, but also of the legitimate Apostolic power of the Episcopate. The sole reason why they were so solicitous for the Roman succession, was because Peter was believed to live on in his Apostolic See. "Does any one," asks Cyprian, "who abandons or resists the chair of Peter, "upon whom the Church is built, imagine that he is in the "Church?" In the same way, if Fathers appeal to the authority of Councils, they are not thereby denying the Primacy of the Roman Church. Popes, like Leo and Gregory, do the same; yet no one will suspect them of tampering with the rights of the Apostolic See. The powers that are in the Church are in harmony and unity. As Christ is the light of the world, so are the Apostles, but each in his own way. As Peter has the keys, so have the others, yet not in the same manner and measure.[47]

20.† The second special Petrine passage,* having reference to the Primacy, is found in S. Luke XXII. 31. 32. In runs thus: "*And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired* "*to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed* "*for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou being once converted,* "*confirm thy brethren.*" The full meaning of these words must be viewed in the light of the whole context. The chapter opens with an account of the last supper (1-20). Then follows the prediction of Judas' betrayal (21-23), and the significant fact is mentioned that "*there was also a strife among themselves, which of them should seem to be greater,*" whereupon our Lord corrected their worldly and heathen notions by setting before them from His own example the true Christian ideas of ruling and

47 Cypr., *Ep.* 37, 1. Hilar., *In Ps.* 86, 2. Aug., *Ep.* 53, 2. Theodor., *In Ezech.* 43, 16. Cyrill. Alex., *In Is.* 44, 23.

* The author leaves out, of set purpose, as he tells us, the Petrine passage from S. Luke xxii. 31. 32, in order to treat of it in the question of Papal infallibility (chap. xiv.) We prefer to have it in its proper place. Our commentary on the passage is based upon his. *Tr*

governing (24-27). Then follows the still more significant fact —viz., the promise that they should be rulers and princes. "*And I dispose to you, as my Father hath disposed to me, a* "*kingdom,*" *because they have continued with Him in His temptations.* [28-30]. Here our Lord has two things in mind. The future Church wherein the Apostles hold sway, and the terrible trial and temptation that was seemingly to put its existence in jeopardy. If the Apostles fail to persevere, then will His kingdom be cast to the winds. To bring about their failure the enemy of Christ and of His kingdom will do his utmost endeavour. The approaching passion of Christ is his hour. He levels his attack against the Shepherd in order the more effectively to master the flock. And now, almost in the face of the apparent victory of Satan, it is necessary to assure them that the enemy will not prevail; that His kingdom will survive; that they will be its rulers; that the Church shall be reared upon the unfaltering rock, as before promised; but that ere it come to pass, a great change would have to be wrought in them all, especially in him who was to be the rock. This assurance concerning the future kingdom of Christ and the position of the Apostles in face of the coming trial is therefore conveyed to Peter in the words that follow: "Simon, Simon, "behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you "as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; "and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." In other words: As by the Father's revelation thou didst firmly confess the faith of my divinity, whereon I promised to build my Church upon thee as on a firm rock, against which the gates of hell should not prevail, so I now tell thee that Satan's efforts are in vain, that thy faith shall not fail, and that rising from a momentary fall, and after being further completely changed [once converted] by the power of the Holy Ghost [see John XXI.], thou shalt in very truth be the strength or rock of thy brethren. The parallelism between this passage and that in Matthew XVI., from a juxtaposition of the two texts, seems

to us to be undeniable. We hold that Christ is repeating here the promise that He gave there. Any interpretation less comprehensive will fail to do justice to the entire context of the chapter; whereas the above interpretation supplies a complete answer to all the questions raised in the chapter; e.g., who is to be the greater among them; how the greater is to be, as it were, the servant of all; how the kingdom disposed to them by Christ is to be firmly established in spite of apparent collapse; how Christ's promise made to all and to Peter in particular is to be fulfilled. Certain minor philological differences, e.g., the precise meaning of "once converted," or of "thy brethren" cannot affect in substance the interpretation given. The reason why faith alone is directly mentioned and connected with the office of confirming the brethren, is the same as in S. Matthew. Firmness of faith is the fundamental condition of the Primacy, as the teaching of the faith is its first and chief function. It is noteworthy that three of the Evangelists divide among themselves the honour of recording the Primacy: Matthew the promise, Luke the repetition of the promise, John the fulfilment. Mark (Peter's Gospel) stands alone in his silence.

21. The third special Petrine passage is in S. John XXI. 15-17, and contains the account of Peter's installation in the Primacy. "*When therefore they had dined, Jesus saith to* "*Simon Peter, Simon (son) of John, lovest thou Me more than* "*these? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I* "*love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs. He saith to* "*him again: Simon (son) of John lovest thou Me. He saith* "*to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He* "*saith to him: Feed my lambs. He said to him the third* "*time: Simon (son) of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was* "*grieved because He said to Him the third time, lovest* "*thou Me? and he said to Him: Lord, Thou knowest all* "*things. Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him:* "*Feed my sheep.*" It is with this account of S. Peter's Primacy,

that S. John ends his Gospel, and we shall hardly be wrong in supposing that he wrote the whole appendix to his Gospel for its sake. He had mentioned the change of name promised to Peter at the first meeting (John I. 42), but, as his manner is, he omitted the promise of the Primacy, as the Synoptists had already recorded it. He has indeed chronicled Peter's confession of Christ's divinity, simply to mark the crisis through which things were passing in Galilee. But having mentioned the denial of Peter along with several other noteworthy incidents during the history of the passion, he could not as it were, take such sad leave of the great Apostle. His picture of Peter would have been misleading and almost an occasion of scandal. As it is the critical school have taken scandal. But, by recording the wonderful scene described above, which sheds such lustre upon Peter's character and office, John has removed all pretext for scandal. At the same time he has furnished us with a valuable supplement to the accounts given by S. Matthew and S. Luke. Of an Anti-petrine tendency there is not the faintest shadow in this chapter. The threefold denial, says S. Augustine, is met by the threefold question and profession of love and humility. Now if the question of our Lord had had no other purpose than to give Peter an opportunity of making reparation for his fall, it would any how prove that he was restored again to our Lord's love and friendship, and also to the promised office and dignity. But, in reality, the question of our Lord implies much more. "That Peter is "elevated here, is unmistakable."[48] The reason of the threefold question is not because Christ had any doubt as to Peter's love, nor because He merely wished to give him the opportunity of a threefold reparation, but because He wished to give emphasis to the charge wherewith He was about to entrust him.[49] A parallel to this is to be seen in Genesis XLII. 9. 12. 14, where

48 Hase, p. 122.

49 Ambros., *In Luc.* x. 175. Cyrill. Alex., *In Joann.* xii. 64. Chrysost., *Hom. in Joann.* 88, 1. Stapleton, *Controv.* ii. 6, 10.

Joseph gives triple expression to his suspicion as to the cause of the arrival of his brethren in Egypt.

In interpreting the text itself, the whole scene and the circumstances under which the words were spoken and the charge delivered must be kept in view. John introduces it with the account of the miraculous draught of fishes, in the capture of which Peter is a chief agent. The scene enacted on another occasion and recorded by S. Luke v. 1-10, when Christ said to Peter "Fear not from henceforth thou shalt catch men," is here repeated with the additional circumstance carefully noted by John, that, this time, the net did not break, though full of large fishes to the number of 153, and that Peter dragged it to land. This signified, says S. Jerome, that he would bring into the net of Christ the multitude of the Gentiles. Then, again, as in S. Matthew XVI., so here our Lord addresses Simon Peter directly and with his full name, to mark the solemnity of the occasion. He demands a confession of Peter's love, because love is above all necessary for one who is to feed the flock of Christ. "The good shepherd gives his life for his sheep" (x. 11. 15). "If it was a sign of fear," says S. Augustine, "to "deny the Shepherd, it is now to be a duty of love to tend "the flock of the Lord."[90] The words "*more than these,*" are, in spite of the denial, very natural after what the evangelist had related in the earlier part of his Gospel (VI. 68; XIII. 6. 37; XVIII. 10.,) and imply no disrespect or depreciation of the others, especially when compared with Matthew XVI. 18; XXVI. 33. Luke XXII. 32. The intensity of love, after all, was a gift of God, and if it entitled the possessor to a greater dignity, it also demanded a greater humility and suffering. So far then, we have a kind of parallelism between the promise of the Primacy and its bestowal. In the former Peter excelled by his profession of faith, in the latter by his profession of love. From a motive of humility, Peter, in his answer, omits the words "more than these," and he chooses the word φιλεῖν

90 *In Joann.* Tr. 123, 5.

instead of ἀγαπᾶν used by Christ, in token of his internal emotion "non solum animi sed etiam corporis sui circa Dei "cultum flagrantiam."[51] The Vulgate has twice "feed my "lambs" (*agnos*) and the third time "feed my sheep" (*oves*) and each time the word *pasce* (feed); while the Greek has the first time βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου, ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου the second time, and βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου the third time. The different shading of the Greek text is certainly not without importance. Peter is to *feed*, with the rich pasture of truth and grace, and he is to *shepherd*, that is to guide and rule the flock.[52] We are all familiar with the Homeric ποιμένες λαῶν, the shepherds i.e. rulers of peoples, and again, with the biblical usage of this metaphor [John x. Ezech. XXXVII. 24. Ps. XXII. 1 (comp. the Hebrew and Vulg.) Mich. v. 2. comp. Matth. II. 6. (Greek text) Acts xx. 28]. Consequently there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the metaphor. It is as simple and as well known as it is beautiful and expressive. The chief shepherd entrusts to Peter's care the entire flock of Christ; his voice they are to hear, his steps to follow, from him they are to receive the food of their soul, truth and grace, by his laws and rules they are to be guided and protected. Peter takes the place of Christ, that is, he becomes the visible supreme shepherd, guide, ruler and teacher of all Christians.[53] We may well argue that if in these words Christ did not make Peter His vicar on earth, no other words could have done it. To say that the whole import of the passage is to restore Peter to the grace and favour of Christ and to the position of an Apostle, is miserably inadequate to the text and context, and is, moreover, rendered quite improbable by other considerations. Peter was pardoned immediately after he had fallen. He was treated not only as an Apostle, but as the chief Apostle, on the morning of the resurrection, and on the Octave day he with the

51 Ambros. *L. c.* 176.

52 Ps. lxxix. 2. Jerem. iii. 15; xxiii. 2. 4. IV Kings v. 2. Malach, v. 4. 6; vii. 14. Matth. ii. 6. Apoc. ii. 27; xii. 5; xix. 15.

53 Chrys. *In Joann. Homil.* 88, 1. Sermo. 6. Arnob. Jun., Ad Ps. 138.

others received the Holy Ghost to forgive sins (John xx. 21). Among Catholic interpreters there is but one, Cyril of Alexandria, who favours this explanation.[54] We are thus bound to conclude that something over and above the common Apostolate is here conferred upon Peter, namely, the Primacy or Vicarship of Christ. *S. Cyprian* after referring to this text continues thus: "And although to all the Apostles, after His "resurrection, He gives an equal power and says: As the "Father hath sent Me, even so send I you: Receive ye the "Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted "unto him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained. "Yet that He might set forth unity, He arranged by His "authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one. "Assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was "Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honour and "power; but the beginning proceeds from unity; [and the "Primacy is given to Peter that they might be shown one "Church of Christ and one See; and they are all shepherds, "and the flock is one which is fed by all the Apostles with "unanimous consent]; which one Church, also, the Holy "Spirit in the song of songs designated in the person of our "Lord, and says: My dove, my spotless one, is but one . . . "Does he who does not hold this unity of the Church, think "that he holds the faith? Does he who strives against and "resists the Church [who deserts the chair of Peter, upon "whom the Church is founded] trust that he is in the "Church." . .[55]

Whether, as some have held, the change of words in *lambs* and *sheep* is indicative of the different classes of the flock, it is difficult to say. S. Ambrose seems to have read *agni*, *oviculae*,

54 *In h. l.* Also *Thesaur. de Trinit. Assert.* 32. Langen, *l. c.* p. 84. Schanz, *Comm. in h. l.* 586. Note 4.

55 *De Unit.* c. 4 (Clark's Transl.) The passages in brackets are those whose genuineness is disputed by some, and categorically denied by the English Translators. It will easily be seen that the Catholic argument is independent of them. Tr See also Leo, *Ep.* 10.

oves,* that it is to say children and adults, or, the beginners, the advanced, and the perfect in faith. *Oves* are *matres agnorum*. Hence some interpret it of the *ecclesia docens* and *discens*,[56] so that all the flock, the Apostles included, are subject to the supreme shepherd, Peter. This inference, if not intended by the change of words themselves, is anyhow implied as a natural consequence. The Apostles, too, had to remain both externally and internally united with their head. Pseudo-Augustine remarks on Matthew XVII. 26 that Peter paid for all the Apostles, because they were all, according to the words of Christ, contained in him. "For (Christ) made him the head "of them all, so that he should be the shepherd of the flock of "the Lord [Matth. XXVI. 41., Luke XXII. 31]. Why does any-"one dispute? For Peter He prayed, not for James or John, "much less for the others. It is manifest that in Peter they "are all contained and having prayed for Peter he prayed for "all."

22. The *Fathers* are unanimous in assigning the office of supreme shepherd to Peter. Langen admits that no one in the East disputed this perogative of Peter.[57] So Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Asterius, Theodoret.[58] The Popes, likewise, at an early age, interpreted this passage of the special office of Chief Shepherd as distinct from the Apostolate. They express themselves in sentences like the following: Peter is set over the other shepherds; Christ has given him a special participation in His own power; against the irruption of wolves, that is, false teachers, God has provided a divinely appointed Shepherd,

* The readings seem to vary considerably. According to Bishop Ellicott the *Codex Vat.* and *Paris.* have ἀρνία, προβάτια, προβάτια, while the *Peschitho* probably read: ἀρνία, προβάτια, πρόβατα, so that a regular gradation in the original text is not improbable. Tr.

56 Isidor. *Ep.* 8, 2. Aug. *Quaest. ex N.T.* n. 75. Bellarmine also.

57 *Kirchenväter*, p. 138.

58 Orig., *In Rom.* v. 10. Chrysost., *De Sacerd.* II. 82. 91. 123. *Homil. I de Poen. Homil. 88 in Joann.* Theodor., *De Div. Car.* (Migne III. p. 1508). Epiph., *Ancor.* c. 9. Joan. Damasc., *De Transfig.* n. 6. 9. 16. See Langen, *Unfehlb.* p. 62. II. 73.

saying to Peter: Feed my sheep. It was proper that this office should be committed to him who was firm in faith and strong in love. In a Roman synod held in the year 531, a letter of Stephen, Metropolitan of Larissa, was read, fully recognizing the Roman Primacy. Gregory the Great remarks that any one who ever read the Gospel, must know that Christ had given to Peter the care of the entire Church. Bede, Alcuin, and the Schoolmen have merely re-echoed these statements.[59]

23. Sometimes the Fathers extend the application of the text to the whole Church, or even to individual believers. And the reason is obvious. They looked upon S. Peter not only as head of the Church, but also as the pattern and example of all Christians. This may be seen more particularly in Chrysostom's work on the priesthood. Love, as he argues, is demanded not only of Peter, but also of priests, in fact, of everyone who has even the smallest charge of the flock of Christ.[60] The Fathers, as we have already said, view the pastoral office and authority as *one* in which many have a share. But this supposes and implies their organic connection and mutual subordination. Thus S. Basil and Theodoret apply the passage to all the Apostles as shepherds in the Church, and it may be similarly applied to all the bishops, as by S. Augustine[61] and S. Leo[62] in the passage quoted above. The common saying of the Fathers, that what was said to Peter was said to the Church, proves but two things: firstly, that the Primacy is perpetual; and secondly, that the entire pastoral office and power in the Church is essentially one, as is the water that flows from one source through many channels. Hence Peter and the Church were considered as synonymous.[63] The Primacy of Peter was universally recognized, so much so that even Alexandria, which

59 Leo, *Ep.* x. Vigil., *Encycl.* A.D. 552. Febr. 5. See Hefele, II. 745 850. Gregor., *Ep.* iv. 3.

60 *In Matth. Homil.* 77, 6. Basil., *Const. Mon.* 22, 4. Theodor., *In Jerem* 3, 24.

61 *De Agon. Christ.* 30: cf. *In Joann. Tr.* 47, 2. *Ps.* 108, 1.

62 *Sermo* II. (al. I).

63 *In Ps.* 35. *Sermo* II. n. 5.

was only founded by a disciple of Peter, acquired, like the other Petrine Churches, the rank of a Patriarchal Church.[64]

24. What, then is the true meaning of Peter's Primacy? What kind of a Primacy was it? Was it a real or only an honorary Primacy? Protestants and Old Catholics maintain that Peter was *primus inter pares*, and nothing more.[65] But the Petrine texts, as explained above, show clearly that a Primacy of jurisdiction, of office, authority and power was conferred on him. To be the rock of the entire edifice, to hold the keys thereof for the purpose of binding and loosing, to confirm the brethren, to feed and guide the lambs and sheep,—are these words of empty honour? Do they not clearly also appertain primarily to work, power and office? But then, it is urged, they mean no more than the work of an Apostle, so so that Peter is still only *primus inter pares*. Verbal quibbling aside let it be granted. But then they mean that Peter is the Apostle of the Apostles; that his work and office and authority extends to them while theirs extends neither to him, nor to each other, but only to the faithful below them This is precisely what Catholics mean by the Primacy. There is a certain dependency of the Apostles on Peter, which, in their case, was perhaps more theoretical than practical, while Peter is completely independent of them. He is the Vicar of Christ. What Christ, when on earth, was to all the Apostles, that was Peter to his brethren and to all the faithful after Christ's departure. Anything short of this meaning will fail to do justice to the position of Peter as described throughout the New Testament, and more especially in the great Petrine texts.*

64 Langen, *Unfehlbarkeit*, p. 88.

65 Langen, *Kirchenväter*, p. 136. *Unfehlb.* p. 89. ii. 91.

* Let any one read the interpretations of Matthew xvi. by Bishop Ellicott, or of John xxi. by Westcott, and he will see how lame and limping, how utterly inadequate and unsatisfactory they are. How embarrassed Protestant Commentators feel in presence of these three great texts, which stand out of the Gospels like three huge Alpine rocks, which they can neither scale nor remove, and must consequently avoid. Hence they are obliged, at much inconvenience, to strike out into tortuous by-paths, and lose their way amid crooked windings. Whatever these gentlemen may think, the texts are of surpassing interest. They were spoken at most critical moments, to the most commanding Apostle, and dealt with matter of the utmost intrinsic importance. Tr.

Moreover, it is impossible to reconcile the *traditional* interpretation of the Petrine texts with a mere Primacy of honour. The statements of the Fathers and Theologians of every age are all too clear and explicit upon the supreme authority of Peter in the Church. True, there may be here and there passages e.g. in Isidore, Bede, Peter Damian, that seem to admit of being adversely construed; but is it not the bounden duty of an interpreter to reconcile them with the clear and decisive statements of the Primacy that occur in other places of their works? Had Langen borne this in mind he would have had no cause to complain of Peter Damian contradicting himself in this respect. At one time, he says, Peter utters views that are generally correct and based upon the Bible; at another, he has caught the infection of the Papal ideas then beginning to be rampant, and sets forth the Pope as the universal bishop, says that all doctrine must be derived from him, who has received the keys of knowledge and power, and to whom the chair of teaching is chiefly *(principaliter)* committed; and hence that every one desirous of being instructed in things divine, must betake himself to this oracle and teacher.[66] The passages are easily reconciled when we remember that Peter Damian, like every Catholic, knew that Simon Bar-Jona was not only an Apostle but was also the supreme head of the Apostolic College and Church.

The same principles will suffice to explain the famous passage of S. *Cyprian* which we have already quoted. If the words were strained, they would not even leave room for a Primacy of honour. The other Apostles, he says, were what Peter was; but Christ gave power and rank to him first in order to show forth the origin of unity. Far from being a difficulty, we hold that these words of Cyprian are not only the most concise, but also the most correct expression of the Catholic doctrine, just as that other and equally celebrated dictum of his: "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur."

66 Langen, ii. 98.

The divine authority and power given by Christ to the Apostles and their successors, and consequently exercised by many, he ever views in its organic unity. It cannot be power pitted against power, or authority against authority; for it is one, and by way of showing that it is one, it resides first in one and then, but not till then, in others; in brief, it is shared and participated. This is what Cyprian means by the showing forth unity,—a showing forth that is not merely symbolical and external, but real and internal. As the rays are one with the sun, and the shoots of the plant with its root, so is the power of the Apostles one with Peter's. He is the principle and source of unity in the Church. But when doing battle for Rome against the heretics of his time, and in his controversy with the Pope, Cyprian availed himself of all the consequences involved in Matthew XVI.[67] For, as S. Augustine argues, he set unity above all things else, and therefore he never broke communion with the Roman Church.

S. Jerome gives the same explanation as S. Cyprian. He thus writes against Jovinian: "But you say that the Church is "built upon Peter. And although, in another place, it is said "to be built upon all the Apostles, and they, too, have received "the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the firmness of the "Church is established, beginning in one, and then passing on "to the rest, yet one of the twelve is elected in order that by "the institution of a head every occasion for schism may be "taken away.[68] *S. Augustine*, on the occasion of the dispute at Antioch, says: "See, how Cyprian refers to Peter, in whom, "as we have also learnt from holy Scripture, by a distinguished "grace shines forth the primacy of the apostles *(primatus apos- "tolorum.")* "For who does not know that that primacy of the "Apostolate is to be preferred to every episcopal office."[69]

67 Harnack, I. 313. Note 2.

68 *Advers. Jovin.* I. 14. Jovinian urged this point of Catholic doctrine in order to show that the married man, Peter, was preferred to the virgin, John. Jerome of course, admits his premisses and denies the inference, saying that Peter's age was the reason of his having been preferred to John. "Aetati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat."

69 *De Bapt.* II. 1, 2 Ambros., *In Ps.* 43, 40. Optat. Mil., *De Schism. Donat.* II. 2

The fact that Fathers like S. Ambrose see in Peter an example of every Christian, does not in the least exclude his Primacy, any more than the fact that Christ is in everything our form and pattern.

25. The juxta-position of Peter and Paul, as the two founders of the Roman Church, is as old as Irenæus. Nor is this any objection to the Primacy. On other occasions, too, the Fathers are wont to join them together and place them, in the same way as John and James, on an equal rank as columns of the Church.[70] But a careful examination of text and context will convince us that, in those passages, they are not speaking of the internal organism of the Church, or of the relation of one part to another, but of the Church viewed as a whole, as an institution, the successor of the synagogue, that takes her place in the history of the world. She rests upon the Apostles, her first founders, as such. They view her as the house of God set up in the midst of a pagan world, and set forth the history of her origin and growth. Is it fair to expect the Fathers never to make a statement concerning the Apostles without minutely distinguishing their relative positions? Is it not sufficient that they call Peter the *first*, the *chosen* Apostle; the *head*, the *mouth*, the *tongue* of the Apostles; the *rock*, the *president*, the *ruler* of the Church; the *shepherd*, the *fisher*, the *teacher* of men; the *prince* and *ruler of the world;* the *key-bearer* and *door-keeper* of the kingdom of heaven? Or, again, when they say that in him and through him the Church's unity is secured against all heresy and schism? Innocent X. has condemned several propositions of Arnold of Brescia, in which the equality of Peter and Paul is asserted in such a way as to deny the supremacy of Peter.[71] S. Bernard has expressed the difference between Primacy and Apostolate by saying that the former was *potestas summa, sed non sola.*

70 Aug., *Sermo.* 55. Ambros., *Ps.* 77, 6. *De Spir.* II. 158. So also Gregor. Naz., Gregor, Nyss., Chrysost, Theodoret, Cyrill. Alex. See Langen, p. 91; II. 85.

71 A.D. 1674. See Denzinger, *Enchir.* n. 965. Also Döllinger, *Christenth.* p. 32.

26. But did Peter *exercise* any Primacy during the lifetime of the Apostles? In the first part of this chapter we gave a sketch of his life up to our Lord's resurrection, and we there argued that everything clearly pointed to a Primacy. It only remains now to pursue the story of his life after our Lord's ascension, in order to see whether Peter acted as if he were the supreme shepherd of the new flock of Christ. Protestant writers, like Hase, boldly assert that there is "not the slightest "trace of any spiritual supremacy of Peter in the history of the "Apostolic Church." All depends on what he precisely means by spiritual supremacy. Of course, it would be absurd to expect that Peter lorded it over the Apostles and faithful; or, again, that his supremacy had the same scope during the lifetime of the Apostles, as it would have in the churches governed only by bishops. We have already explained that each of the Apostles had received divine mission and authority from Christ (i.e., universal jurisdiction over all the faithful, exclusive of the Apostles themselves), and personal infallibility, together with all the grace and virtue required for their Apostolic calling. The result of this would be an absolute unity of mind, and heart, and purpose among the Apostles. But with equally unerring instinct would they recognise and respect the institution of Christ, according to which one of them, who had always been their leader, was now the rock of the Church, the key-bearer, the shepherd set over the lambs and sheep of Christ's flock. The whole question, therefore, resolves itself into this: Are there any clear and unmistakable signs and proofs in the history of the Apostolic Church, that they regarded Peter as their leader, or that he acted in that capacity? Does it appear that while no Apostle claimed the right to command his brother Apostle, Peter might, if necessary, lay claim to guiding and commanding them? Let the New Testament supply the answer.

27. Peter comes to the fore in the election of a new Apostle in the place of the traitor Judas. He moves and proposes the

election, he determines the mode of election, and lays down the conditions requisite in the person of the elect. (Acts I. 15 seq). He comes forward on the day of Pentecost to address the multitude gathered together. The people, stirred by his words, come to Peter and the Apostles. (Acts. II. 14. seq. 37). Peter heals the paralytic at the gate of the temple (III. 1 seq.); he speaks to the people (III. 11), and he is the spokesman before the council (IV. 8; V. 29). He passes judgment upon Ananias and Saphira (V. 1 seq.). Peter and John, at the request of the Apostles, go to Samaria (VIII. 14). Peter passes judgment upon Simon Magus, whom the ancients called the father of heretics. Peter makes the first visitation of all the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria. At Lydda he heals Aeneas (IX. 32); at Joppe he raises Tabitha to life. He again, by special revelation, is sent to receive the first heathen convert, Cornelius the centurion (X. 1). He, too, is miraculously delivered from prison, prayer being made for him by the whole Church (XII. 1). At the Apostolic Council he rises first and passes sentence upon a question involving a point of dogma. "This act, at once the most magnanimous and "disinterested on the part of Peter, saved Christianity at a "critical moment," says Pfleiderer,[71] and he thinks that "for "this reason the Church justly held the authority of Peter in "high esteem." Let us now sum up these incidents and express them in more modern speech. Peter received into the Church of the Apostles the first converts, both from Judaism and heathenism; he worked the first miracle; he punished the first persons guilty of disrespect and disobedience; he cast out of the Church the first heretic; he made the first Apostolic visitation of all the churches; he presided at the first Council of the Church, he pronounced the first dogmatic decision. Now what more could we reasonably expect, to make it clear that Peter was the focus of the whole Apostolic activity? In the Acts of the Apostles, he is so manifestly the central star

71 *Das Urchristenthum*, etc. Berlin 1887, p. 47.

round which the others revolve, and towards which they gravitate. He is to all the man of light and leading. What a commentary upon the Petrine texts of the Gospels!*

28. The *Epistles of S. Paul* also bear witness to the Primacy of S. Peter. And they are all the more important, as S. Paul was naturally anxious to safeguard his right to be considered a true and genuine Apostle, called, like the rest, immediately by God, and having received the Gospel direct from Christ. Nevertheless S. Paul seems equally anxious to set himself right above all with Peter. He not only uses by preference the word *Cephas*, but he also tells us that he journeyed to Jerusalem to know Peter (Gal. I. 18). Now the context forbids us to think that he undertook the journey merely from motives of idle curiosity or politeness. The motive was rather the same as that which he himself indicates as having prompted his second journey to Jerusalem (II. 2). He went in consequence of a revelation, and in order to be recognized as an Apostle especially by those who held foremost rank, so that he might not run in vain. It was necessary for him to be duly engrafted into the existing organism of the Apostolic college, so that all should recognize him as a true Apostle of Jesus Christ. For this purpose he went to see Peter. It was then agreed that Paul should preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, while Peter devoted himself chiefly to the Jews. Paul, then, received the divine revelation or deposit, and mission from God, ordination in the Church at Antioch (Acts XIII. 1), and recognition or approbation from Peter. Weizsäcker,[73] a representative of the modern critical school,

73 *Apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 12.

* Protestants generally argue thus: "Because Peter was foreknown by our Lord to do these things, therefore did He (prophetically) call him the rock, the key-bearer, the shepherd. The Petrine texts are but the prophecy of an historic and transient fact, not of permament office in the organic constitution of the Church. According to them there is no reason why Peter rather than any one else acted as he did." The evasion is ingenious, but not natural. The argument, if applied to the other Apostles, would lead to the absurd conclusion that they, too, were without office and power, and that Christ, when giving them His power and mission and promise of assistance, was simply predicting what, as a matter of fact, they would after His departure! *Tr.*

remarks thus on this subject: "When Paul had gone over to "the Christian cause, he first settled everything in his own "mind and with Him who called him . . . But having "done this, he tried as everyone would naturally have done, to "put himself in touch with the existing Apostolic community. "Not indeed with the entire community, because this even on "merely external grounds, was impossible, but with Peter, and "this was sufficient. Nothing more was needed. He therefore went to Jerusalem solely for the purpose of seeing and "knowing Peter; for in Peter he saw the embodiment of all "christianity as it then was. The position of Peter had been "recognized by the Master (Christ) Himself, who had distinguished him above all the others. It is equally plain that "in the sequel Peter maintained his prominence; he held his "position, not in a false tradition only, but as far as we can see, "in history itself."

29. Even the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch serves to illustrate the peculiar importance of Peter's position. It was Paul's fear lest Peter's example should influence the whole Church, that led him to take such energetic measures. Some of the Fathers have tried to solve the difficulty by a distinction between Peter and the Prince of the Apostles,[73] or by representing the whole dissension as a simulation.[74] S. Cyprian however prai es S. Peter because he accepted the fraternal correction of S. Paul, and did not arrogantly appeal to his Primacy, and taunt Paul with having been a persecutor of the Church. S. Augustine, too, in the passage quoted above, endorses Cyprian's view. In his celebrated epistle to Jerome also, wherein he gives his reasons for not accepting the view that the quarrel was a mere feint, he says that the conduct of Peter and the example he gave to his successors, was far holier and rarer than that of Paul, though both are good. Superiors, he says, should humbly accept correction, and inferiors should not

73 Clem. Alex., *ap.* Euseb. i. 12. Cf. Hieron., *In Ep. ad Gal.* ii. 11.
74 Orig., Hieron. See above, chap. viii. n. 5.

shrink from the bold task of pointing out the faults of superiors. Augustine himself follows the example of Peter, and repeatedly asks pardon of Jerome for any offences he had given him. "For though the Episcopate is higher than the Presbyterate, "yet is Augustine in so many things inferior to Jerome.[75] S. Thomas refers to this dispute as furnishing an exception in the matter of the fraternal correction that an inferior is allowed to administer to a prelate. "For to resist in the face and before "all, exceeds the limits of fraternal correction, and therefore S. "Paul would not have blamed S. Peter in that manner, unless "he had considered himself in some manner as his equal, "namely in so far as the defence of the common faith was con-"cerned . . . Hence Paul, who was subject to Peter, "publicly corrected him on account of the danger of scandal "regarding the faith, and as the glossa of Augustine says: "Peter himself has given his hearers an example, that where "they have deviated from the right path, they should not be "ashamed to accept correction from inferiors."[*] Similar examples may be quoted from ecclesiastical history, e.g., S. Bernard and Catherine of Sienna.

30. Our doctrine is thus defined by the Vatican Council: "We therefore teach and declare that according to the testimony "of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal "Church of God was immediately and directly promised and "given to blessed Peter the Apostle by Christ the Lord. For "it was to Simon alone, to whom He had already said: Thou "shalt be called Cephas (John i. 42), that the Lord after the "confession made by him, saying: Thou art the Christ, the "Son of the living God, addressed these solemn words: Blessed "are thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood have "not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. "And I say to thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I "will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail

75 *De Bapt.* ii. 1, 2. *Ep.* 82.
* S. Thom. ii. ii. Q. 33. a. 4 ad 2.

"against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom "of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it "shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt "loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.* And it "was upon Simon alone that Jesus after His resurrection "bestowed the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all "His fold in the words: Feed my lambs: feed my sheep.† At "open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture as it "has been ever understood by the Catholic Church are the "perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of "government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, "deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the "other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was "endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of juris- "diction; or of those who assert that the same primacy was "not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter "himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on "Peter as her Minister."

"If anyone, therefore, shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle "was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the "visible Head of the whole Church Militant; or that the same "directly and immediately received from the same Our Lord "Jesus Christ a primacy of honour only, and not of true and "proper jurisdiction; let him be anathema."‡

* S. Matthew xvi. 16-19.

† S. John xxi. 15-17.

‡ Concil. Vat. *De Eccles.* Cap. i. (Card. Manning's Transl.)

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRIMACY OF THE POPE.

I. PERPETUITY OF PETER'S PRIMACY.

1.* The Church, founded by Christ, spread and consolidated by the Apostles, is, in the words of Irenæus, the rich vessel wherein the Holy Ghost has deposited the treasures of truth and grace, in order that all men of all places and times may draw from it, as from an unpolluted living source, the waters of life. She is the living teacher of truth, and the faithful dispenser of grace, the mother of all who are born unto the supernatural life of the children of God. She is the visible representative of Christ. Her voice is His voice; her hands are His hands; her head is His head; and her body His body. Her mission and power are His mission and power. She is formed on the pattern of the Hypostatic Union. The human and the divine elements in her are inseparably united. Consequently her organism in which the divine and human are blent in one, can neither change nor cease to be. However much her history and life may vary in their outward manifestations, or grow in their internal fulness, she will ever be the same individual body. With this body Christ promised to remain for all time.

But if this be the end and nature of the Church, it clearly follows that, whatever forms an essential part of her organism, must be as perpetual as the Church herself. Now we have shown in the preceding chapter that the Primacy of S Peter is an organic element, nay, *the* first and foremost organic element, in the constitution of the Church. It must therefore be as

perpetual as the Church herself. Moreover, the reason why Christ made Peter His own Vicar, chief shepherd and head of the Church, is not far to seek. It was in order to give unity to the Church and to maintain that unity efficiently. *Ut omnes unum sint.* "And there shall be one fold and one shepherd." But this reason will hold good as long as the Church lasts. Nay, it will apply with even greater force to later times, because with the material expansion of the Church, the dangers of heresy and schism must be proportionably greater. Therefore the source and centre of unity can never fail.

2. Again, the need for the powerful agency of an external centre would make itself felt in the Christian community in proportion as the latter receded from its first origin. That origin was so brilliant and striking, because surrounded with such a halo of supernatural splendour, that its glory, like a circle in the water, was ever enlarging itself, fascinating the eyes of men, and mightily attracting them to itself. But later generations having no longer the advantage of beholding with their own eyes the imposing and majestic figures of the Apostles, or their mighty showing forth of the Spirit, stood in far greater need of other motives of faith, and other means of preserving the unity of the Church. Without an external and divinely instituted organization it would have been impossible for the Church to steer her bark amid the surging floods of a wild sea, or to hold her fortress against the batteries and assaults of the gates of hell. How could she, we will not say, have triumphed, but even have made a show of resistance in the great struggles and persecutions of the 2nd and the 3rd centuries, without a firmly welded internal organization and absolute consciousness of its invincible strength? She must inevitably have been felled to the ground, and have succumbed to the deadly blows of her intellectual and physical assailants. But what is the chief, the main element in that organization? The Primacy. It is this that gives it unity and strength. Try as we may, it is labour lost to try and conceive the Church as possessing a mission that

compels her to be ever on the aggressive and ever on the defensive, and yet as an organization without a strong central power.

3.* Nevertheless, the perpetuity of Peter's Primacy is not based merely upon *a priori* reasons. Nor again is it a mere inference from Scripture. On the contrary it is *directly* contemplated and affirmed in the Petrine texts in themselves, especially when taken conjointly, and also when collated with those texts which declare that the Apostolate is to last till time shall be no more. If it is true that the Apostles are sent to be witnesses to Christ and to teach all nations till the consummation of the world, and that the divine Spirit will abide with them for ever (see chapter XI), then it is equally true that the first and chief of them, who is the rock, the strengthener of the brethren, the key-bearer of the kingdom, the shepherd of lambs and sheep, will also endure for ever. Peter's position and office, and the existence of the Church, are correlative. As long as the Church stands, as long as there is anything whatever to be bound and loosed, any brethren to be confirmed, any lambs or sheep to be fed, there must be the living rock, the head key-bearer, the main support of the weak, the chief shepherd. If he ceases to exist, the Church *ipso facto* collapses. Such is the direct, obvious, and natural force of the Scripture passages. The words were spoken by the Architect and Chief Builder of the Church, and they reveal His plan and design. Or, again, they are the words of Him who establishes His fold. The words are in themselves absolute and unlimited; the subject matter of which they treat is by its very nature to endure, and it is expressly said to be invincible (Matth. XVI). The very institution, then, of the Primacy entails its perpetuity. For this reason it is certainly more logical, if not more biblical, to deny the existence of Peter's Primacy altogether than to admit its existence and to deny its perpetuity.

4.† There is, moreover, another argument for the necessary continuity of the Primacy, which may be conveniently stated

here, with all the more reason as it is seldom distinctly formulated or insisted on. While not wishing to exaggerate its force, we will say that it seems to us to nip in the bud the favourite Anglican theory on the constitution of the early Church. We submit, then, that the Apostolate itself is perpetual only in virtue of the Primacy; that, without the Primacy, there is no Apostolic succession, and no Apostolicity in the Church. This contention is entirely based on *a posteriori* grounds. The special prerogatives of the Apostles, as is generally admitted, were three, namely, (1) *universal jurisdiction*, (2) *individual infallibility*, (3) *direct divine mission*. Now, it is quite clear from the history of the New Testament, especially the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, that none of these prerogatives passed on to the bishops whom the Apostles appointed in their place as rulers of the Church. Their jurisdiction was *particular*, not universal. It was limited to a definite town, or country, or province. Titus was bishop of Crete, Timothy of Ephesus, and so forth. Bishops, as we learn from the Acts and the Ignatian epistles, were constituted 'per singulas civitates.' It is equally clear, and equally generally admitted, that they were not individually infallible, and that they had their mission, not directly from God, but from the Apostles. Their mission was essentially 'missio apostolica,' as distinguished from 'missio divina.' They depended on the Apostles both for the power of order and jurisdiction. Their election, consecration, and institution was the work of an Apostle. Their jurisdiction was not only limited in character, but was essentially dependent on the Apostles. Any one of the Apostles could at any time revoke it, if there were reason or cause for so doing. The bishops, then, were Apostolic men (viri apostolici), not Apostles. And they were Apostolic men in as much as they had mission directly from an Apostle, and held jurisdiction, which was limited to their own See, and dependent on each and all the Apostles. We are not denying that these bishops could consecrate new bishops and found new Sees, but, technically

speaking, they could do this, not in virtue of their jurisdiction, which was limited to their own See, but only by special Apostolic power. Thus the new bishops became Apostolic men in their turn, and certainly held jurisdiction dependent on, and revocable by the Apostles as long as the latter were living; for these held jurisdiction universal, that is, over every church, no matter by whom it had been founded. Now let us suppose that all the Apostles die, and none remains. That a radical change must now come over the whole constitution of the Church will be seen at a glance. For no one now possesses universal jurisdiction, or individual infallibility, or direct divine mission; nay more, there is no one to create new Sees, or impart true and real Apostolic mission; no one who has jurisdiction in all the churches, and, stranger still, the jurisdiction of each bishop, hitherto essentially dependent and revocable, has now become independent and irrevocable. Such are the necessary and inevitable consequences, on the supposition that all the Apostles have died, and that the Apostolate with its three prerogatives has died with them. But, it will be urged, might not individual bishops be dependent on, and subject to, the jurisdiction and judgment of a number or majority assembled in synod? Certainly not, if each bishop be independent in his own See, and limited to that See. No number of particular jurisdictions will ever make one universal jurisdiction. Yet such universal jurisdiction must be at the back of each synod, unless it be usurping a power not its own by nature. The one conclusion, therefore, that forces itself upon a thinking mind, is that all the Apostles cannot have died; that one, at least, must live on, and if so, that he is naturally the head of the Church. On the other hand, if Christ has from the beginning instituted a head of the Church, that head will naturally be an everlasting Apostle in the Church. Thus the Apostolate lives in the Primacy, and it is the Primacy that makes the Church and the succession of bishops truly Apostolic. To abolish the Primacy is to abolish the Apostolate, and the abolition of the Apostolate means

disruption and disorganisation, and the inevitable dissolution of the Church. If, then, the Church is to be everlasting and Apostolic, the Primacy must be perpetual.

5. That this truth is written on the first page of the Church's *history*, has been shown repeatedly in the preceding chapters, and the demonstration will grow as it proceeds. All the Fathers are agreed on this point,—that Peter is ever living in the Church. He ever presides in his See, ever occupies the one chair of truth, and gives the true faith to all who seek it. With the Church wherein he presides, all other Churches must be in harmony. The Church is one because it is built upon one foundation, Peter. The Episcopate is one, because bishops participate in the Apostolic power, that exists first in one. "The strength of the foundation is not shaken by the immense "weight of the temple that is reared upon it, because the firm- "ness of faith that was praised in the prince of the Apostles, is "everlasting; and as that which Peter confessed of Christ, will "ever remain, so also will that remain which Christ instituted "in Peter."[1] "Where Peter is," says S. Ambrose, "there is "the Church." "Can any one," says S. Cyprian, "who "abandons the chair of Peter, hope to be in the Church"?

II. THE ROMAN SUCCESSION.

6. Who, then, are the successors of Peter? The decision rests with history alone, and its verdict is spoken in clear and unfaltering accents. It unmistakably asserts that it has ever been a fixed belief that Peter continued to live and to preside in the See of *Rome*, and nowhere else; that the bishops of Rome and none other were Peter's successors; that they succeed by divine right, because Christ instituted the Primacy as a permanency. It was His divine will that there should be successors to Peter. They also succeed by an Apostolic right, inasmuch as it rested with Peter to determine the manner of succession. It was left to Peter to decide that the Bishop of

1 Leo M., *Sermo* ii. 2. Cf iv. 2; Ep. x. 2, 9; xlv. 3. Chrysol, *Ep. Leon.* 25. Mansi, *Concil.* iv. 1290. Hefele, ii. 200.

Rome rather than of any other city, should be his successor, and no doubt he had special reasons for giving the preference to Rome. He made known his will by himself assuming the Roman Episcopate, and holding it until his death. This fact of his Roman Episcopate firmly fixed the form of succession. The Bishop of Rome, when legitimately elected, is the successor of Peter in the Primacy and in the Apostolate. Hence the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, that is of the Pope, is the complex result of truth and fact. It supposes the revealed truth of the perpetuity of the Primacy, and the twofold historical fact that Peter was Bishop of Rome and that he made the Roman Episcopate the sole title of succession. The question whether Peter was ever in Rome, though not necessarily identical with the fact of his Roman Episcopate, is practically bound up very closely therewith.

7. Excepting the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, the New Testament writings give very scanty information about the life and journeys of Peter. In chapter XII. 17 it is said, in a somewhat mysterious manner, that "he went to "another place." This must have been sometime about 44 A.D. After that he is once more mentioned as assisting at the Council of Jerusalem. Many Catholic interpreters and historians have suspected this "other place" to be Rome, being of opinion that any other place would have been mentioned by name.[2] The immediate purpose of the narrative is to show that Peter intended to seek a place of safety from the persecution that was raging in Jerusalem. This he might have secured by going to Antioch, where he also stayed for a while after the Council of Jerusalem. But was there any reason for not mentioning Antioch as the term of his journey? None whatever, unless it be the general reason that Luke is silent as to all S. Peter's transactions in the Church at Antioch. But as Luke wrote the Acts in Rome about the year 63 or 64, if Rome

2 See Aberle-Schanz, *Einleitung*, p. 55. Hagemann, *Röm. Kirche*, p. 661. Hettinger, *Fundamentaltheologie* 2 ed. 1888, p. 612. Hundhausen, *Das Erste Pontificalschreiben* etc., Mainz 1873, p. 15. Döllinger, *Christenthum*, p. 95.

was the term of Peter's journey, it is easier to understand why Luke would not mention it by name, especially if both Peter and Paul were then present in the city.

Romans were present in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost (Acts II. 10). Since, too, there was a large contingent of Jews in Rome, there must have been frequent and active intercourse between the two cities, both in politics and in religion. Hence it is not improbable that Peter, with his shrewd practical sense, had, early in his career, fixed his gaze on the imperial city and seized the first opportunity to repair thither His sojourn was not continuous, since we again find him later on in Jerusalem and at Antioch, and perhaps also in Corinth. The Jews were expelled from Rome probably in the year 50, and the Jewish Christians (Acts XVIII. 2) were included under the same ban. Nevertheless the Christian community in Rome must very soon afterwards have revived, and even flourished; for S. Paul writes, about the year 58, that their "faith was spoken of in the whole "world" (Rom. I. 8). "For your obedience is published in "every place" (XVI. 19). This testimony, moreover, gives us a clue to the founding of the Roman Church. For it is scarcely conceivable that the Roman community would have acquired such internal strength and celebrity, had it not, like all the other greater Churches of the time, been founded and ruled by an Apostle. From the latter part of his Epistle we learn that he had had "a great desire, these many years past, to come" to them (XV. 23), of whom he was assured that they were full of love, replenished with all knowledge and able to admonish one another (XVI. 14), but that he has been kept away till now when he had resolved to take his journey into Spain (XVI. 24). In verse 20, moreover, he says: "And I have so preached this "Gospel, *not where Christ was named*, lest I should build upon "another man's foundation." All this seems to imply that the Roman community was founded by an Apostle indeed, but not by Paul. Döllinger says: "That the Roman Church arose "without a founder, or that it was founded by Aquila or

"Priscilla, or mediately by Paul, are quite untenable opinions."[3] The fact that Paul does not mention the name of the founder need not cause surprise, as the addressees of the letter were well acquainted with it. From I Cor. i. 12 we gather that the name of Cephas was not unknown in the West. As the parties that had arisen in the Corinthian Church, were due to the personal presence of Paul and Apollo, so it is probable that the party of Cephas had arisen in like manner. Anyhow Clement of Rome has drawn this inference.[4]

8. But when we come to the first Epistle of Peter, we begin to tread surer ground. It was written in *Babylon* which, according to the unanimous opinion of the ancients, following the precedent set by the Apocalypse, means Rome.[5] That it refers to the Babylon on the Euphrates, is an opinion of much later introduction,[6] which found advocates in Erasmus and many Protestant commentators.[7] It is, however, clearly refuted by the fact that the great city on the Euphrates was, at the time of Strabo and when Christ was born, a mere waste and desert.[8] In consequence of the antagonism that was rife between the Babylonians and the Jews, the latter had left the country before S. Peter's first Epistle was written. The Egyptian Babylon near Cairo is quite out of the question, being utterly unsupported by tradition. The symbolical designation of the imperial city, though it may be surprising, is not inexplicable. The relation in which this epistle stands to *Romans*, may furnish a clue to the date of its composition. The similarity between the two is undeniable, and can only be explained on the supposition that one served as the pattern of the other. The probability is that the Epistle to the Romans is earlier.

3 *L. c.* p. 98.

4 I Cor. 47. See Döllinger, p. 313 ?

5 Euseb., *H. E.* ii. 15, 2. Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 1050. Rosenthal, *Apokryphen*, p. 41. 57. 73. Aberle, p. 257. Seufert, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1885. p. 154. Hundhausen, *l. c.* p. 85.

6 Cosmas Ind., *Topogr. Christ.* ii. (Migne T. 88. p. 114 D).

7 Lipsius, *Apokryphe Apostelgesch.* i. 27. 610; ii. 145. Hug, *Einleit.* ii. 474.

8 Strabo, xvi. 738. Plin. *Hist. Nat.* vi. 24. Joseph., *Antiq.* xviii. 9.

It falls between the years 50-64, but everything points to 64 as a more approximate date than 50. Again the notice in S. John's Gospel deserves some attention. It tells of the martyrdom of S. Peter and the manner in which he met his death. The place, indeed, is not named, simply because the faithful, for whom the Gospel was intended, would know that Peter had been crucified, and would consequently know the place. But we have very early, if not contemporary evidence, that he was crucified at Rome. No other place can advance even the most shadowy claim. Scripture furnishes no direct evidence that Peter was ever in Rome. But from what we have said, there are not wanting indications which, taken in conjunction with tradition, are sufficient to create certainty on the point. It is, therefore, simply an exaggeration, when Protestant writers, like Hase,[9] assert that there is no trace whatever in scripture of Peter's Roman sojourn; but to assert further that neither is there a vestige of the Roman Primacy to be found in the sacred books, is to cap an exaggeration with a fabrication. For if there is anything written in luminous characters in the gospels and other writings of the New Testament, it is the two truths implied in the Papal supremacy, viz., the perpetuity of the Apostolate and of Peter's Primacy.

9. That Peter came to Rome, is attested by the unanimous voice of Tradition, which derives confirmation from the fact that no city but Rome has ever claimed to possess the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles. It is just possible that Peter might have disappeared from the scene without leaving a trace behind him. But, considering the position he holds in the Gospel, the possibility will never grow into a probability. The Apocryphal writings reveal the fabricators of legends busy at work; but howsoever busy, they never dared to tamper with the historical fact of Peter's death. Even the comparatively late and heretical legend on Peter-Simon, though very different from the old

9 P. 127.

historical tradition, has not gone so far as to deny the Roman sojourn. The earliest notices are found in Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Papias. *Clement* in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written about 96 A.D., reminds his readers, that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom together, and he classes them with the other victims of the Roman persecution ('among us'). *Ignatius*, in the beginning of the second century, while on his way to Rome to be martyred, writes to the Romans saying that he does not wish to command them as Peter and Paul had done.[10] This implies that Peter had been in Rome; for no written communication of his to the Romans has come down to us. *Papias* merely mentions that the second Gospel was written by Mark from the discourses delivered by Peter, but he does not name the place where it was written. Now Mark, as we know from Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, wrote his Gospel in Rome. But the testimony of Clement is substantially the same as that of Papias, and Eusebius expressly refers to him. Therefore, we may conclude that Papias was of their opinion as regards the place where the second Gospel was composed. As to the date of its composition the opinions leave a wide margin between the years 42-67. Eusebius advocates an earlier, Irenæus a later date.

10. *Dionysius* of Corinth, about the year 170, writes to the Romans, that Peter and Paul planted the Church in Corinth as well as in Rome, and suffered martyrdom together in the latter city.[11] *Irenæus'* testimony, however, is much more important, because he had learnt, from his master Polycarp, the Asiatic tradition of S. John. He says that "the greatest and oldest "church in Rome, which was known to all, had been founded "and organized by the most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul." *Tertullian* says that these two Apostles sealed the Gospel

10 I *Cor.* v. 6. Ignat., *Ad Rom.* iv. 3. Papias. *ap.* Euseb., *H. E.* iii. 39 (40 17). Clem. Alex.. ii. 15. cf. vi. 14, 5. Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgeschichte*, ii. 1, 18. Schanz, *in Marc.* p. 11.

11 Euseb. ii. 15. Iren. iii. 3, 2; 1, 1. Tertull. *Adv Marc.* iv. 5. *De Praescr.* c. 32. 36. *Scorp.* c. 13.

preached to the Romans with their blood. His later Montanistic interpretation of the Petrine text in Matthew XVI. only proves that, according to the Catholic tradition of the time, Peter was believed to have been in Rome and to have bequeathed his power to the bishop of Rome.[12] The Roman presbyter *Cajus*, about 200 A.D., writes that in his time the trophies of the two founders of the Roman Church, Peter and Paul, were shown on the Vatican hill and on the road to Ostia.[13] Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Commodian, Lactantius, Peter of Alexandria, and others, write to the same effect. We therefore conclude in the words of Döllinger:[14] "That Peter has laboured in Rome, is a fact "so well attested, and so deeply interwoven with ancient "history, that those who reject it as a fiction, are bound, "in consequence, to relegate the entire ancient history of "the Church to the realm of fable, or at least to envelop it "wholly in the mists of uncertainty."

11. The historical spirit of the age has done much towards changing the views of Protestants in matters affecting the Catholic Church. This is a case in point. The denial of Peter's sojourn in Rome was at one time the staple dogma of Protestant writers. The dogmatic and polemical interest demanded it, as Lipsius candidly confesses in the following words: "If ever the Prince of the Apostles "set foot in the eternal city, he certainly did not go as a "simple traveller, but in virtue of his Apostolic Power; "and his martyrdom, in that case, forms but the glori-"ous ending of his official labour among the Romans. "And if, as many Protestants also hold, the episcopate is of "divine institution, then the claim of the Roman Church "to trace her episcopal succession back to Peter, is after "all not so very absurd."[15] Protestant historians, with rare exceptions,[16] now generally admit Peter's sojourn in

12 *De Pud.* c. 21.

13 Euseb. ii. 28.

14 P. 313.

15 Lipsius, *Zeitschrift für Protest. Theol.* 1876, p. 562.

16 Hase, p. 124, 131. Wichelhaus, *Akad. Vorles.* 1875, i. 88.

Rome. They even go so far as to warn their own supporters against weakening the Protestant cause by advocating such untenable opinions.[17] We may be allowed to quote Lipsius once more. Speaking of Irenæus, who, in order to prove the Catholic doctrine against heretics, appeals to the uninterrupted succession of Roman Bishops, he says: "The interest that Irenæus takes in the Roman tradition, "is due not so much to the personal fate of Peter as to the "fact that he and S. Paul were the founders of the Roman "Church. The source from which he drew, was the *offi*"*cial* Roman tradition, such as it had established itself at "the time of Eleutherius (174-189). Above all he found a "catalogue of the Roman bishops reaching as far back as "Linus who had been instituted by Peter and Paul. This "was probably the same list, previously found by Hege"sippus when he came to Rome, under Pope Anicetus "(154-166 or 155-167), which he completed down to Eleu"therius, second successor of Anicetus (Euseb. iv. 11, 12). "It may therefore be considered certain that as early as the "year 160 the Roman Church traced her origin back to the "two Apostles."[18]

12. As regards the *duration* of Peter's Roman sojourn, there is likewise a tradition dating back to Eusebius and Jerome that Peter stayed, though not continuously, 25 years in Rome, namely from 42-67.[19] The year 42, however, although in harmony with the most ancient tradition, is rendered difficult by Acts XII. 1 seq.; for, Peter's imprisonment, more probably, falls in the year 44, and a Roman journey before that date is not very likely. The question has no importance for our present subject, except in so far as it enables us to draw at least this inference, that Peter was closely connected with the

17 Harnack, *Patr. Ap. I Clem.* i. 5. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.* 1878, p. 508. Seyerlen, *Entstehung etc der ersten Christengem. in Rom.* Tübingen, 1874. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 484.

18 Lipsius ii. 1, 16.

19 Euseb., *Chron. ad ann. 2 Claud.* Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.* c. 1. Oros., *Hist.* vii. 6. Lact., *De Mort. Pers.* c. 2.

foundation of the Roman Church,[20] that he made there a more or less protracted stay, and that he died there during the Neronian persecution which raged from 64-67. The year 67 is the date of his death as given by Eusebius,[21] and it has the greatest probability on its side.

13. Here we can only very briefly allude to the special Papal catalogues to which the Fathers appeal in proof of the Apostolic Succession of the Roman Church, the only one among the Apostolic Churches that has survived and braved every storm. Linus is named as the *first* bishop of Rome after Peter and Paul. "The blessed Apostles (Peter and Paul) "founded this Church and committed the Episcopal office to "Linus. He was succeeded by Anacletus, after whom, in the "third place from the Apostles, Clement obtained the See."[22] Eusebius names Linus as the first; the Apostolic Constitutions locate Linus and Clement between Paul and Peter, but their testimony is more recent and cannot prevail against the older witnesses. Rufinus writes thus: "Linus and Anacletus "were bishops in the city ot Rome before Clement, but while "Peter was still alive; so that they exercised the Episcopal "office and he the duties of the Apostolate." There is no absolute inconvenience in this hypothesis. The two bishops may have been Peter's coadjutors during his life time, so that after his death, first one of them succeeded, the other remaining his coadjutor, and then succeeding in his turn. The example of Peter and Paul served as a precedent. The Synod of Arles, A.D. 314, calls the Roman Church the chair of the two Apostles.[23]

Rome, then, the mistress of the world was chosen by Peter as the city in which he set his chair (cathedra), and with that chair the Apostolate and the Primacy thenceforth re-

20 Hageman, p. 632.

21 Euseb., *l. c.*

22 Iren. iii. 3, 3. Euseb. iii. 2. *Constit. Apost.* vii. 46. Rufin., *Praef. in Clem. Recogn.*

23 *Ep. i.* ad Sylv. Döllinger, p. 318. Hefele, i. 204. See Epiphan. xxvii. 6.

mained inseparably united. The Roman bishop himself is Peter, the head of the Church universal, the Apostle ever living in his Church. Why was Rome chosen rather than any other town? The reason could not but be most providential. For one thousand years Jerusalem had been the centre of revealed religion, and the dwelling place of the true God. But the holy city with its unbelieving people was rejected, and its doom foretold. In view of all this it was necessary to elect another city as centre of the new Israel, of the new great Christian commonwealth. And providence had already been preparing the way. The capital of the universal monarchy was chosen by the humble fisherman to be the mistress of the new world, the kingdom of Christ. Who can look back upon the history of the first three centuries without exclaiming: Evidently the finger of God is here. "The stone which the builders "rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. This "is the Lord's doing: and it is wonderful in our eyes" (Ps. 117, 22. 23).

III. EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF PAPAL PRIMACY.

14.* Can it be proved that Rome claimed and exercised Supremacy in the early Church? Before answering this question, it is necessary briefly to recall the argument of the first chapter of this volume. The law of development, it was there stated, applies to the deposit of revealed truth, to the faith and life, and all the institutions of the Church, and to herself as a whole. Consequently it must also hold good in the matter of the Primacy of the Roman Church. It is not in the natural course of things that the powers latent in the human soul should stand revealed in their fulness at the outset. Mental power, strength of will, and force of character, in a word, all the acts of the reasonable soul, are the outcome of slow and steady growth. And the growth and expansion come from within. In like manner the Church was at first a young, tender, and delicate organism, the author of which was Jesus Christ, who

had both formed its body, and breathed into it His own life-giving Spirit. The Church was, therefore, a living being, and, as such, capable of growth and expansion from within. Its head, too, was a living head, and capable of ruling and governing the whole body as time and circumstances might demand. Consequently there was no necessity whatever for Christ to minutely determine by word of mouth every detail of the competency, power, and attributes of the head of the Church. But if this be so, we cannot expect the proof for Rome's Primacy to stand out with as much clearness in the first as in the tenth century; this would be to disregard all laws of historical development; it would, in fact, be monstrously unreasonable and at variance with every known analogy. To say that the Nicaean Fathers invented the belief in the consubstantiality of Christ, or that the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon invented belief in the unity of His person, would be less absurd than to say that Leo, or Gregory, or any other Pope, invented the Primacy of the Roman Church. The real question at issue can only be: Is the Primacy of the Roman Church a natural development of the Church that was in the time of Christ and the Apostles? Or again, to put the question in another way: Are there any traces, however faint, which go to show that Rome claimed some superiority and a leading part in the early Church? To this question there can be but one answer.

15. The first and oldest testimony to the superior position of the Roman bishop comes to us from the Epistle of *Clement* to the Corinthians.[24] The fact itself of Clement being appealed to, while John, the Apostle, was still alive, coupled with the fact that he undertook the task of recalling the Corinthians to a sense of duty, as well as the whole tone of this Epistle, cannot be satisfactorily explained except on the assumption that the Roman bishop claimed some sort of a superiority over other bishops.* *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch and Martyr,

24 *Epist. ad Cor.* c. 56-65. See Hefele, *Theol. Quart.* 1845. p. 191.

* A portion of the letter, hitherto missing in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, has been restored from a new MS. found in the year 1875. The passage restored runs thus,

not only praises the Roman Church for her great excellence in virtue and doctrine, but he styles her, in his address, as the 'president of the brotherhood' (προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης). That our translation of the Ignatian phrase is the correct one, appears from other passages in the Saint's letters.[25] Christ has established a great covenant of love, a great brotherhood, founded upon Peter, and Rome is the president thereof. Ignatius uses the same term of bishops who preside in the place of God in each Church. It is exactly the *caput ecclesiae.*

16. But the testimonies of Clement and Ignatius, important and relatively clear as they are, gain in strength as we come nearer the second and beginning of the third century. *Irenæus* is absolutely decisive on the point of the Roman Primacy. He not only states that the Roman Succession is clearer and more carefully guarded than any other, and is sufficient for all purposes as a proof of orthodoxy, but he states, in set terms, that the Church of Rome is the head and mistress of all the Churches in the world, and the infallible rule of faith. "*Ad hanc enim* "*ecclesiam propter potiorem principalita tem necesse est omnem* "*convenire ecclesiam.*" "With this Church, *on account of her* "*higher rank and power*, every other Church must agree, that is, "all the faithful whoever they are must agree with her, because "in her the Apostolic Tradition is ever preserved."[26] This is the modern Catholic doctrine of the Pope, though not in modern speech. The Roman Church is the unerring guardian of Apos-

in Professor Salmon's translation: "If any disobey the words spoken by God "through us, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression "and no small danger, but we shall be clear from this sin . . You will cause "us joy and exultation, if obeying the things written by us through the Holy "Spirit, you cut out the lawless passion of your jealousy according to the inter- "cession for peace and concord in this letter. But we have sent faithful and "discreet men, who have walked, from youth to old age, unblamably amongst us, "who shall be witnesses between us and you. This have we done that you may "know, that all our care has been and is that you may speedily be at peace." Dr. Salmon remarks thus upon the passage: "Very noticeable in the new part of "the letter is the tone of authority used by the Roman Church in making an "unsolicited (?) interference with the affairs of another Church." [*Ap.* Allnatt, *Cath. Petr.* p. 91, and taken from *Dictionary of Christ. Biogr. and Liter.* vol. i. p. 558]. Tr.

25 *Trall.* xii. 1. *Rom.* ix. 3. *Phil.* xi. 2. *Smyrn.* xii. 2. *Martyr. Ignat.* v. 3.

26 Iren. iii. 3, 2.

tolic Tradition, because of her Primacy, that is, because Rome is the See of an ever-living Apostle, who was the head of the Church from the beginning. Every attempt to whittle down the natural and obvious force of his words by stickling at the word *convenire* or *principalitas*[27] must appear to a serious mind to be trifling with the subject. The passage flows like a torrent in its majestic grandeur; and these critics would have us divert our attention to a few mere bubbles floating on the surface. Irenæus, therefore, furnishes a commentary on the action of Clement, and the words of Ignatius.

17. The first, however, who not only bears testimony to the Roman Primacy, but views it, as it were, scientifically, that is, in its organic connection with the unity of the Church, is *S. Cyprian*. The Roman chair, according to him, is the chair of Peter, and the principal chair; it is both the symbol and the principle of unity among the presbyters and in the whole Church.[28] On Cornelius' election to the Roman bishopric he writes: "Cornelius has been made bishop of Rome, as the place of Fabian, "that is, the place of Peter, and the degree of the sacerdotal "chair (the highest degree) was vacant."[29] Whoever communicates with him communicates with the Catholic Church. Upon the doubtful portions of the passage, and whether they affect our argument, as well as upon his and Firmilian's opposition to Pope Stephen, we have remarked in a previous chapter.[30] Cyprian never loses sight of this fundamental factor in the constitution of the Church. In commenting upon the passage in John xx. 21-23, he premises: "To Peter, upon whom "Christ built His Church, and from whom He instituted and "showed forth the origin of unity in the Church, He first gave "the power."[31]

18. *S. Ambrose*, in the 4th century, is equally explicit on

27 See Iren. iv. 38, 3.
28 *Epist.* 59, 14; 43, 5; 55, 8.
29 *Epist.* 52. Cf. Pacian. *Ep.* 3. See Rösler, *Prudentius*, p. 322.
30 Chap. xi. p. 377-383.
31 *Epist.* 75.

the Roman Primacy, and the place it holds in the organism of the Church. His dictum, "*ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*," clearly refers to the Bishop of Rome.[32] He warns the emperors against the designs of Ursinus, and entreats them not to allow the head of the whole Roman world, i.e., the Roman Church, and the holy faith of the Apostles, to be disturbed; for it is the source whence all the members of the venerable community derive their rights.[33] Moreover, he bears witness to the fact that the Roman Church, according to the ancient Tradition of both East and West, was considered the judge of controversies. "Even if the proposed Council had not taken place, they ought "to have had recourse to the judgment of the Roman Church, "and of Italy and the whole of the West, according to the "ancient right and custom of their forefathers, and after the "example of Athanasius of blessed memory, and Peter of "Alexandria, and most Orientals."

19. *S. Jerome's* conviction on this subject was as deep as his devotion to the Roman chair of Peter was ardent. The language of his letters to Pope Damasus is, indeed, at times so exuberant, that our opponents see reason to suspect his sincerity. But, on the one hand, to lavish unstinted praise upon his bold and free judgment of the hierarchy, and, on the other, to suspect mean flattery, is measuring the same man by two different standards. It is certain, says Zöckler,[34] that Jerome's devotion to the authority of the Roman See was the result, not of cringing flattery, but of genuine conviction. Jerome himself says: "Be it far from me merely to desire to please the Apos"tolic See of Rome; I am only speaking with the successor of "the fisherman, with the disciple of the cross." "While follow"ing (and acknowledging) no one as first but Christ, I join "myself to your holiness, i.e., to the chair of Peter; I know "that upon this rock the Church is built. Whosoever eats the

32 *Ps.* 40, 30. See *Katholik* 1888. I. p. 133.

33 *Epist.* 11, 4.

34 Zöckler, *Hieronymus*, p. 73.

"lamb outside this house, will perish in the flood. Who-"soever gathers not with thee, scattereth, i.e., whosoever "does not belong to Christ, is of Anti-Christ." Were Rome even to make a new faith after that of Nicæa, he would follow Rome.[35] We can understand this kind of language when we try to realize his feelings of grief at the sight of all the havoc and devastation that heresy and schism had wrought upon the church of the East. The glorious inheritance of the faith had been squandered in the various churches by bad bishops. The only remedy lay with that Church whose faith S. Paul had praised above all others,—the Church of Rome and the chair of Peter. "You are the light of the world, the salt of the earth, the "golden and silver vessels." And in the Meletian Schism, and in his controversy about Origen,[36] his conduct was in harmony with this his supreme conviction.

20. As to *S. Augustine*, his testimonies to the Primacy of Rome are so numerous that it is difficult to make a selection. The Roman chair on which Anastasius sits to-day,[37] is the chair of Peter. Next in rank is the See of James in Jerusalem. And Augustine tells the Bishop of Carthage, that he has nothing to fear from the revolutionary mob of conspirators, provided he be certain that he is in close union with the Roman Church, where the primacy of the Apostolic Church has ever flourished.[38] In the Donatist and Pelagian controversies the Church of Africa appealed to the judgment of the Roman, that is, of the Apostolic Chair, and rested by its decision. To contradict Rome, was to oppose the chair of Peter. When Rome has spoken, the matter is ended.[39]

21. The same universal and catholic conviction of the Roman Primacy likewise found expression in Councils. Philip, the papal legate, thanks the Fathers assembled at

35 *Epist.* 15 (57) 2. *Ep.* 16.

36 *C. Rufin*, I. 1.

37 *C. Liter. Petil.* ii. 51, 118.

38 *Ep.* 43. 3, 7.

39 *Ep.* 186, 2; 191, 2. See Reuter, *August. Stud.* p. 302. Optat. Milco. ii. 3.

Ephesus for that "the holy members (of the body) have adhered to their head, *well knowing* that Peter is the head of "the whole faith and of all the Apostles." "We cannot," says S. Peter Chrysologus, "decide in matters of faith "without the consent of the Roman bishop." And the bishops at *Arles* write to Leo, that the most holy Church of Rome, through the most blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, holds the Primacy over all the churches.[40]

22. In the East, too, the Roman Church was recognised as having the Primacy in the Church Universal. Besides the words of Ignatius quoted above we have the example of Polycarp repairing to Rome, to settle the dispute arising from the Paschal controversy. Smyrna, be it noted, repaired to Rome, not Rome to Smyrna. Abercius of Hierapolis did the same. It is indeed true that Polycrates,[41] the representative of the Asiatic bishops, would not submit to Pope Victor,* nevertheless the Roman view proved to be right, and ultimately found universal acceptance. In subsequent times it became the custom to refer all *causae majores* to the Apostolic See. S. Athanasius relates that one of his predecessors, Dionysius, when accused, had justified himself before the Pope.[42] Athanasius himself sought the protection of the Bishop of Rome. Theodosius A.D. 380 sent forth an edict wherein he says: "We desire that "all peoples find themselves in that religion which is de- "clared to this very day to have been delivered to the Ro- "mans by the Apostle Peter, and which Pope Damasus

40 Mansi, *Concil.* iv. 1290. Hefele, ii. 200. Leo, *Ep.* 25; 65, 3. Hefele, ii. 336. Cf. Vinc. Lir., *Common.* c. 9.

41 See Jungman, *Dissert. in H. E.* vol. i. p. 155.

42 *De Sent. Dion.* c. 13. *De Synod Nicaen.* c. 26. Hefele, i. 255.

* Harnack, a very competent critic, has recently defended the opinion that the treatise *De Aleatoribus*, generally found among the works of S. Cyprian, is an encyclical letter of Pope Victor. In that treatise occurs the following passage: "Et quoniam "nobis divina ac paterna pietas *Apostolatus ducatum* contulit et *Vicariam Domini* "*Sedem* coelesti dignatione ornavit, et *originem authentici Apostolatus*, super "quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus, accepta simul "potestate solvendi: salutari doctrina admonemur, ne cum delinquentibus assidue "ignoscimus, ipsi cum eis pariter torqueamur. Ideo sal terrae dicimur, ut ex nobis "fraternitas coelesti sapientia saliatur." Tr.

"and Peter of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic holiness, follow."[43] "In a letter to Pope Symmachus the Eastern Church says: "Daily the Apostle teaches thee that thou shouldst feed the "sheep of the whole world committed to thee."[44] Cyril of Alexandria while regularly addressing Nestorius as colleague (συλλειτουργός), calls Pope Celestine the Father (πατήρ), with whose holiness the churches, according to custom, are in communion. Theodoret's language, again, is so strong that we fancy we are reading S. Jerome. Against the *Latrocinium* or Robber-synod, he writes a most touching letter to the Pope, acknowledging his Primacy, and asking him to bring help to the Church of God tossed about by the storm. "But I "shall await the sentence of your Apostolic Chair, and I beg "and adjure your holiness to help me in my appeal to your "right and just judgment-seat, and to allow me to come to you "and prove that the Apostolic doctrine and mine are one." "I await your decision. Bid me to abide by your judgment, "and I shall bear it." "I entreat your holiness, . . . have "pity on me, oppressed in my old age with calumnies, and "persecuted without cause, and deign to think me worthy of "your zeal and care. But above all guard the faith that is "fraudulently attacked, and preserve the paternal inheritance "of the churches from corruption."[45]

23. The same may be said of the Eastern Councils, although at this time New Rome was straining every nerve to raise herself to an equal rank with Old Rome. We shall not adduce as direct evidence statements like the following: *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*, which was also read in the Council of Chalcedon; nor again the words of the edict of Valentinian III: "Since the merit of S. Peter, the prince of the Episcopal dignity, "and the dignity of the City of Rome, and the sentence of the "Holy Synod have confirmed the Primacy of the Apostolic

43 *Codex. Theod.* xvi. 1, 2. Sozom., *Hist. Eccl.* vii 4.
44 Mansi, viii. 221. Cyrill., *Ep.* 11.
45 *Epist.* 113. 116. 118. Hefele, ii. 390.

"Chair, no one is to arrogantly undertake anything against the "authority of this Chair."[46] For, these statements have direct reference to the Patriarchal dignity of Rome. Nevertheless the reasons assigned for that dignity in the Roman Church show its connection with the Primacy. For the same reason the 6th canon of Nicæa cannot be adduced as an argument against the Primacy; it, too, has reference to the Patriarchal privilege.[47] But it is certainly significant that the two Roman legates signed the decrees of the Council immediately after Hosius. This fact would go to confirm the opinion of Gelasius of Cyzicus that Hosius presided in the place of the bishop of Rome; which opinion also finds its support in certain passages in the writings of Athanasius and Theodoret.[48] The Synod of Constantinople A.D. 381 claims but a primacy of honour for the Church of Constantinople; but the Roman Church only recognized what that Synod decided in matters of faith. The Council of Chalcedon went a step further by simply claiming the second rank for the patriarch of Constantinople. The Papal legates forthwith protested against the canon which cannot, consequently, be considered a canon of a General Council;[49] nor was it ever confirmed by the Pope. On the contrary, Leo offered strenuous and persistent opposition to canon 28. But the Primacy of the Pope was fully recognized both by the Fathers of Chalcedon, and of Ephesus. By his celebrated *epistola dogmatica* Leo had prepared the way for the decision of the Council, as Celestine had done at Ephesus. The Fathers assembled recognized in him their leader, and head, the voice and teaching of Peter, the Apostle. Nothing could induce Leo to countenance the ambitious projects of Constantinople. To build up in any other way than upon the rock which Christ has laid, he held as fatal to the Church. Constantinople, in

46 Leo, *Ep*, 12.

47 Hefele, i. 397. 402.

48 Hefele, i. 40. 302.

49 Hase, p. 135 thinks that the rejection of the canon was a '*dangerous precedent!*' See Hefele, ii. 531. 563.

fact, was not an Apostolic See, and no degree of personal holiness in its bishops, or of political external magnificence could make it such.[50] For the same reasons Gregory the Great had to administer a severe rebuke to the Patriarch for assuming the new and unheard-of title of "Œcumenical Patriarch."

Leo's successors, following in his footsteps, have claimed the *privilegium Petri* for Rome. It was her privilege to be the rock upon which the Church was built; to have the keys for binding and loosing; it was her duty, therefore, to safeguard the faith, to feed the lambs and sheep, to watch over all the churches of the world, and to keep them from error.[51] Their appeal is to the authority of Peter, or of Peter and Paul, but never, except once,[52] to Paul alone. Hence when the Eusebians, after deposing Athanasius in a synod at Antioch, A.D. 340, declined the invitation to come to Rome, with the remark that the authority of a bishop does not depend on the greatness of his city, and that all bishops are of equal honour, Julius I. thus replied: "Do you not know that it is customary to "write to us first in order that what is right may be de- "cided first from here (ἔνθεν)? If, therefore, a bishop was "(as you suppose) suspect, the matter ought to have been "reported to our Church."[53] Socrates thus remarks upon "their proceeding: Julius, the bishop of Rome, was "neither present nor represented by any one; though "there is an ecclesiastical canon forbidding churches to "make laws without the consent of the Roman bishop." The synod of Sardica, A.D. 344, also confesses that the bishops of all provinces send their reports to the head, that is, the chair of Peter.[54] Boniface I. writes to say that the greatest churches of the East are wont to consult the Apostolic See in matters of grave importance, and that Theo-

50 Gregory M., *In Reg.* i. 5 (Opp. iii. 2, 250). Hase, p. 135.
51 Langen, *Kirchenväter*, p. 136.
52 Gregor. M., *In Reg.* I. 5 (Opp. III. 2, 250). Hase, p. 135.
53 Athan., *Apol. c. Arian.* c. 35. Cf. c. 26. Hefele, I. 498. Möhler, *Ethanas.* II. 66, Socrat., II. 8, 17.
54 Hefele I. 543, 611. Bonif., *Ep.* 16, 6.

dosius had asked Pope Damasus to confirm the election of Nectarius to the Patriarchal See of Constantinople.

24. In the face of these testimonies from all quarters of the Church, from men whose knowledge and integrity is beyond suspicion,—testimonies at once clear and precise and unwavering,—it is futile to assign either the political ascendency of Rome, or her usurping, aspiring ambition, as the cause of Papal supremacy. For, the reason invariably assigned by all is not the political power of the city, but the fact that Peter continues to live in the See of Rome, which is therefore the institution of Christ. And as for Papal usurpation, it has never yet been explained, how the Popes could have successfully advanced their claims, had they been new and unheard-of, or out of harmony with the general faith and conviction of the entire Church. For the rest, there are witnesses other than Popes, and, if possible, even more numerous, who acknowledge Rome's primacy and invoke her Apostolic authority. How thoroughly the Papal claim was recognized by the Churches, is made especially clear from the transactions and letters that passed between Africa and Rome in the Pelagian controversy. The African bishops report to Pope Innocent I., and ask him to confirm their decision. He writes back to the Fathers of Milevis A.D. 417: "Whenever the cause of faith is in question, "I believe that all the brethren and our episcopal brethren "report to Peter, that is, to him who bears his name and "honour, as you, beloved, have done; such (a course) will be "for the general profit of all the churches of the whole world." Again, to the Synod of Carthage, A.D. 417, he writes: "Not "by human, but by divine thought have the Fathers decreed, "that everything . . . should first be brought to the notice "of the Apostolic See, in order that by its complete authority "the just decision should be confirmed, and that from thence "other churches should learn what to command." Pope Zosimus also writes to the bishops in Africa A.D. 318 in this strain: "Although the tradition of the Fathers has attributed to the

"Apostolic See so great an authority that no one dared to "dispute its decisions, and though this has always been observed "and sanctioned by canons and rules, and though the prevailing "discipline of the Church till now pays due reverence to the "name of Peter, from whom it (the See) descends . . . . "nevertheless we have . . ."[55] With general Councils the case seemed somewhat different, because the Papal legates presided; still it is probable that they also required approbation in some form or other. For Gelasius says: "To none other "than the first See does it belong to carry out the decision of "a synod approved by the consent of the whole Church; to "[the first See] also does it appertain to confirm by its authority "every synod, and to maintain its enactments, according to its "supremacy, which the Apostle Peter has received by the word "of the Lord, and which it has ever since held and maintained." In the same letter Gelasius likewise safeguards the right of appeal to Rome for all Christians.[56]

25. It is far more likely that the real reason why Rome was chosen as the seat of the Primacy, is that assigned by Leo. Tacitus had said of Rome that it was a cesspool into which every country in the world poured its filth and corruption. And Leo thought that the rock of the Church was planted in Rome, because it was in Rome that the opinions of philosophers had to be combated, the vanity of earthly wisdom put to confusion, the worship of demons destroyed, impious sacrifices abrogated; in Rome, the great seat of superstition, where every error stalked in broad daylight,—the citadel of truth had to be erected.[57] No wonder that the emperors recognized the Primacy of the Roman Church. Its importance, even from a political point of view, was incontestable. Eusebius mentions that Aurelian in giving judgment against Paul of Samosata, decided

55 Mansi, iv. 366.

56 Gelas., *Ep.* 26, 3. 5. 44. *Decret.* Cf: c. xxv. Q. 1. c. 1. For further passages see Petav., *De Eccl. Hier*, III. 15. 16. Schwane II. 847-893. Heinrich II. 325-388. On the "Old Catholic" side, see Langen, *Kirchenv.* p. 136. *Unfehlb.* I: 55. 88.

57 *Sermo*, 82, 3.

that the Episcopal palace should belong to the one in communion with the bishops of Italy and of Rome.[58] Valentinian III. incorporated the Primacy in the code of laws.

26. As a result of development the title of Pope (*papa*, πάππας, πατήρ) came gradually to be reserved to the bishop of Rome. Originally the word was used to express the simple relation between master and disciple; and in this sense it probably dates back to a very ancient oriental usage. Thence it passed into the Old and New Testaments. In the Christian Church, as we learn from Tertullian and Cyprian, the name was chiefly given to bishops. In the 4th and 5th centuries we often meet it in both Eastern and Western writers.[59] Augustine uses it frequently. But from the sixth century onward it was gradually reserved for the bishop of Rome, and in the eighth this was the common practice, although exceptions are to be met with as late as the end of the middle ages. The Council of Chalcedon called the bishop of Rome 'Œcumenical Patriarch,' but no Pope adopted the title.[60] Gregory the Great and Leo IX. declined it. Constantine Pogonatus in a letter to the Pope calls him 'universal Father' (οἰκουμενικὸς πάππας)[61] The Synod of Pavia A.D. 998 rebuked the arrogance of the archbishop of Milan in accepting the title of Papa. The Synod of Rheims A.D. 1049 declared the bishop of Rome the only *Primas* and *Apostolicus* in the Church. Otto I. addresses the Pope as the "Supreme Bishop and Universal Pope." In addition to these titles, he was, at various times, also called "Bishop of Bishops,"[62] "the Head of Heads,"[63] "the Father of Fathers."[64]

27. The general belief and conviction of the Church, in this as in other matters, is borne out by the involuntary testimony

58 *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 30.

59 Möhler, *Patrol.* p. 25. Kraus, *Real-Encycl.* ii. 581. August., *De Gest. Pelag.* l. 2. *Ep.* 223. Valent., *Ad Aug. Ep.* (Migne x. 911).

60 Hefele, iv. 768. 773.

61 Hefele, iii. 250. iv. 653. 728. 731. 785. 653.

62 Tertull. *De Pud.* c. 1.

63 Theodor. Stud. i. 34.

64 *Ep.* Gelas. 11. See Hettinger, *Die Kirchl. Vollgewalt.* 1887, p. 79.

of *Heretics*. They, too, have at one time or another recognized the Roman Primacy, as long as there was any hope of winning it over to their side. Hagemann's remark on this subject is happy. He says: "The founders of heresy, "from Simon Magus to the Gnostic chiefs, Valentine and "Marcion, were ever impelled by a curious instinct towards "Rome, as if their doctrine, once the sect were established "in Rome, would receive a higher kind of consecration "and confirmation."[65] Marcion only began a schism after his doctrine had been rejected by the Pope. Felicissimus of Africa travelled to Rome to obtain the recognition of Fortunatus. The Eusebians strive to win Julius I. over to their side. Pelagius and Celestius were enabled to defy the bishops of Africa by professing their faith at Rome. Nestorius and Eutyches knew full well that they could not win the day unless they gave a satisfactory account of themselves at Rome.[66] It may, therefore, justly be said, that heretics have always been fully alive to the great gain that would accrue to them in public opinion from being in communion with Rome, and that they only rejected the Primacy when it had rejected them.[67] But in all these fierce religious controversies victory has uniformly rested with Rome. All other ancient churches, all the Apostolic Sees of the East, fell in turn a prey first to heretics and finally to infidels. But Rome has stood unshaken and unmoved; she has saved the Apostolic Tradition, the integrity of the faith, and of the constitution of the Church. Is this blind chance? Or is it history furnishing a natural commentary upon the Petrine Texts?

The *formula Hormisdae*, that is, the profession of faith (*regula fidei*) which the bishops of Epirus, March 18, 517, sent to Pope Hormisdas, and which had to be signed by the Oriental bishops, holds that history is a commentary upon the words of the Gospel. It runs as follows: "The Rule

65 *Die Röm. Kirche*, p. 47.

66 Epiphan., 42, 42. Cyprian, *Ep.* 55, 14. Hefele, I. 491. Aug., *De Pecc. Orig.* c. 2. 5. 6. Hefele, II. 159. 334.

67 Hefele I. 492.

"of Faith: The first act of salvation is to keep rightly the "rule of faith, and in no way to deviate from the decrees "of the Fathers. And in as much as the words of our "Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed over, who said: "'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my "'Church,' etc. . . . These words are confirmed by "*their effects;* for in the Apostolic See religion has always "been preserved spotless." Taking their stand upon this conviction they proceed to condemn Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Timotheus Aelurus, Petrus (Acacius) and Peter of Antioch—all heretics and all who are in communion with them. Then they continue thus: "Wherefore we receive "and approve all the letters of Pope Leo, and all that he "wrote concerning the Christian religion. Therefore, as "we have said, following in all things the Apostolic See "and professing all its decrees, I hope to be worthy to be "in that one communion with you which the Apostolic See "enjoins, in which is the perfect and true solidity of Chris-"tian religion; and I promise also that the names of those "who are separated from the communion of the Catholic "Church, that is, who are not united in mind to the Apos-"tolic See, shall not be recited in the Holy Mysteries. "This, my profession, I have subscribed with my own "hand, and presented to thee, Hormisdas, Holy and Ven-"erable Pope of the City of Rome. xv. Kal. April. Aga-"pito viro clarissimo Consule."[68]

Protestant writers generally recognize the preponderating influence of the Roman Church and the Papacy in matters of faith and religion, but they try to account for it in a different way. The historical fact is as great a stumbling-block in their path as the Scriptural texts. Here are the words of Harnack: "The Roman Church "was the first to have a formulated baptismal profes-"sion of faith; the first to have a canon of the New "Testament, and a list of Episcopal succession. It was "she, who first turned to use the idea of the Apostolic suc-

68 Mansi, viii. 407. Hefele, II. 673.

"cession of bishops. It is to a Roman bishop, moreover, that "the Eastern Churches trace all the most important Apostolic "ordinances regulating the organization of the Church, and, "as it seems, rightly so. True, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and "Origen rose up against the pretensions of Calixtus—these "were therefore innovations—(!); nevertheless Calixtus gained "the day. Accordingly there can be little doubt that the "fundamental Apostolic ordinances and laws of Catholicism "were framed and shaped in the same city that had also made "laws (civil) for the world at large."[69] The same author is of opinion that such sayings as '*Ecclesiâ semper habuit primatum*,' or, 'Catholic and Roman-Catholic are identical,' are gross fictions invented in the interest of the several occupants of the Roman See. Still, he thinks that, if transferred to the Christian 'community' existing in the chief city of the world, they contain a great truth, without which the process by which the Churches were united and catholicized is unintelligible. This, translated into other words, means that without these *fictions* the Church would have been neither one nor catholic. Such is the divine force of fiction! Another writer speaking of S. Boniface, who has recently been roughly mauled for romanizing the German Church, says: "Boniface certainly romanized central Europe; "but without Rome it would have been impossible to rear our "mediæval culture upon the ruins of the Old World. The "Church would have been splintered up into so many national "Churches, and Christianity would have been still further pagan-"ized."[70] Tschakert thus delivers himself on the same subject: "Meanwhile the position of the Roman bishop grew stronger "and stronger from century to century. When the flood of "barbarian irruption began to sweep away the social and political "framework, the Roman chair alone stood firm as a rock in the

69 Harnack, i. 362; 371.

70 Looss, *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1817. No. 8. How the English Church was preserved from the same fate by Rome and Rome alone, may be seen from Möhler's dissertation: *Anselm, Erzbischof von Canterbury, ein Beitrag* etc. Ges. Werke, i. 32. See also Weingarten, *Tabellen*, p. 19. Funk, *Histor Jahrb.* 1883, p. 5. *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 192.

"sea. Odoacer, Alaric, Attila, Theodoric—they came and went; "but the See of Rome besides standing firm as the rock of "the Christian Church, also became the harbour and refuge of "Greek and Roman culture. Add to this, that in all dogmatic "controversies the Roman bishop, with the shrewd practical "sense of the Romans, has generally known how to keep the "golden mean. When Athanasius was persecuted in the East, "he found support in Rome, and the Council of Chalcedon "was simply building dogmas upon the mind and thoughts of "Leo."[71] But how different is the account given by Leo himself, who saved Rome from Attila, the "scourge of God." Addressing the city of Rome, he says: "The Apostles are holy "Fathers and true Shepherds, who have incorporated thee into "the kingdom of heaven, and founded thee in a much better "and happier way than those who laid the foundations of thy "walls. They have raised thee, by the chair of Peter, to the 'the glory of being a holy and chosen people, a priestly and 'royal city, the head of the world. Now, by divine religion, 'thou wieldest sway over a wider tract, than thou didst formerly "by thy earthly power.[72]

28. There is no need to pursue the historical argument for the Primacy of the Pope further. An impartial study of the theoretical doctrine and the practical claims of the Papacy in the *Middle Ages* will show that they were but the natural outcome and development of the previous belief and practice of the Church which we have expounded at length in this chapter. Papal supremacy ever based its claims upon the Petrine texts of the Gospel, as upon the great divine charter of the Church's constitution. That power grew and developed, like everything else in the Church, with time and circumstances; its application became more extended and intense as the need arose. To expect that every application of Papal power should be exegetically provable from the texts of Holy Writ is idle and

71 Tschakert, p. 48.
72 *Sermo* 82, 1

unreasonable. Christ instituted the Primacy as a living intelligent force, not as a scheme with all its powers minutely drawn out on paper. It was enough to know that the Apostle Peter was ever living in the See of Rome, and that the Pope could, at all times, be addressed in the words of Theodorus Studita (d. 826) as "Apostolic Head, divinely appointed Shepherd of "the flock, Key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven, Rock of the "faith upon whom the Church Catholic is built." *Nicolas I.*, when protesting against the illegitimate election of Photius to the See of Constantinople (A.D. 861) strongly urges the rights of the Roman Primacy. The supreme judgeship over the whole Church was a privilege granted by God and inherited from Peter and Paul. And these rights were admitted in the *libellus satisfactionis* of the 8th general Council (A.D. 869).

29.* To this epoch (about 850 A.D.) belongs the now celebrated Pseudo-Isidore, author of the *False Decretals*. By these are meant certain letters of the early Popes (e.g., Anacletus, Pius, Alexander I., Marcellus, Julius), which he composed and represented as having emanated from them. In these *Decretals* he puts statements into the mouths of the Popes which they never uttered. They were, in fact, the expressions of a later age. The forgery, however inexcusable, is still perfectly intelligible. The Church has ever held fast to Tradition as her leading principle. *Nil nisi quod traditum est* is her standing rule. But together with this principle there is another, namely that of development, which, generally speaking, passes through three stages: (1) simple faith or implicit tradition; (2) analysis or discussion; and (3) universal consent or definition and explicit proposal. Hence the not unnatural temptation, especially in men of more zeal than discretion, to represent doctrines as formally and explicitly contained in the earlier tradition, when as a matter of fact, they are but virtually and implicitly contained therein.

The *False Decretals* are a case in point. The doctrines advanced in them regarding the Papal power were firmly estab-

lished in the religious belief of the age. They were clearly the natural outcome of the Primacy which, as we have seen, was always believed, and hence they were generally received at the time. They contained nothing new. Hase himself admits that "they were not made under the eyes "of the Pope, nor in his immediate interest . . . but "the Pope simply accepted what the general belief of the "age offered him."[73] The differences between the Pope's power in the early and later centuries affect Canon Law rather than dogma. The latter is ever the same. It is the Primacy or Headship of the Universal Church pure and simple. Its manifestations, as set forth in the enactments of Canon Law, will vary with time and circumstances. Ultimately Pseudo-Isidore rests on no other basis. "The Roman See," he says, "received from Christ Himself the "Primacy over the whole Church, and its authority is "based upon that of Peter and Paul." That the bishops, who are pillars in the Church, are built upon Peter, the rock and foundation,[74] may be a clearer enunciation of what we read in the Fathers, but it is not materially different from their doctrine. Whatever effect upon the rights and privileges of Primates the *False Decretals* may have had, their importance for the Papal claims, at any rate, is wholly imaginary. The Papal fabric, that was built up in the ninth and following centuries, rested as heretofore upon Apostolic Tradition, not on Pseudo-Isidore. Nor, again, is it surprising that the Papal prerogatives are chiefly vindicated in the letters and decrees of the Popes. The same thing is done in civil legislation. Governing bodies define their own rights according to usage or agreement. The Primacy, if a divine institution, must necessarily be self-asserting.

30. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, then, have wrought no change whatever in the organic constitution of the Church. The relation between Pope and bishops, and their respective rights in the Middle Ages remained what they were before.

73 P. 142.
74 In the supposed letter of Athanasius to Pope Julius.

Peter Lombard, who calls Peter the first of the Apostles, and the Pope his successor, is even credited by some with having "pronounced in favour of the Episcopal system, and with "having based it on biblical grounds."[75] "There are," says S. Bonaventure,[76] "many bishops, some archbishops, a few "patriarchs, and only one Father of Fathers who is rightly "called Pope. For he is the first and highest spiritual Father "of all Fathers, the Shepherd of all the faithful, the excellent "Hierarch, the one Bridegroom, the undivided Head, the "Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, the Fountain and "Source and Rule of all Ecclesiastical power, from which all "regular power flows to the lower members of the Church; all "this is in perfect accord with his exalted position in the Eccles- "iastical hierarchy." In the same way S. Thomas Aquinas,[77] who is accused by some with being the first to erect the plenitude of Papal power into a dogma, looks upon the Pope as a king in his own kingdom, while the bishops, who have a share in his government of the Church, are like the judges in the various cities of the realm. "Because the Sovereign Pontiff is the "representative of Christ, therefore has he the full power of "dispensation." In his Opusculum against the errors of the Greeks (A.D. 1261) occurs a passage, similar to that in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, to the effect that it is necessary for salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. The chief propositions laid down by S. Thomas are: The Pope is the highest of all the bishops. He holds the Primacy over the whole Church. He has the plenitude of the Ecclesiastical Power. He has the power given to Peter to decide in matters of faith. He is above the Patriarchs.

75 *Sentent.* iv. 24, 9.

76 *Brevil.* vi. 12. See the New Edit. by Ant. a Vicetia, Frib. 1881. p. 563. Schwane iii. 547.

77 *In Sent.* iv. d. xx. q. 1. a. 4. ad. 3; d. xxiv. q 3 a. 2. *C. Gent.* l. iv. c. 76. *Summa* ii. ii. q. 88. a. 12. ad. 3. III *Suppl.* q. 40. a. 6. See Leitner, *Der H. Thomas über des Unfehlb. Lehramt des Papstes.* Freiburg 1872, p. 70. On his *Opusculum c. errores Graecorum* see Grauert, *Histor. Jahrbuch* 1888, p. 146. Schwane, iii. 547. 552. The passages from the Fathers were taken from a collection of Urban IV. Against it, see Langen, *Unfehlb.* iii. 100.

31. Coming to the Mediæval *Councils*, we find the same doctrines affirmed. The fourth *Lateran Council* (A.D. 1215) in renewing the old privilege of the Patriarchal Sees, simply says that after the Roman Church, which is the Mother and Teacher of all the faithful, Constantinople holds the first place, Alexandria the second, Antioch the third, and Jerusalem the fourth.[78] But the *Council of Lyons*, A.D. 1274, treats expressly of the Primacy of the Roman Church. It drew up a form of profession to be made on oath by the Greeks in the following words: "The Holy Roman Church has supreme and full Primacy over "the Universal Church, which it truly and humbly acknow-"ledges to have received from the Lord Himself in Blessed "Peter, the Prince and Head of the Apostles, with plenitude of "power. And as before all others it is bound to defend the "truth, so also, if any questions arise concerning the faith, "they ought by its judgment to be defined. . . And to the "same all churches are subject, and to it the prelates of the "same render obedience and reverence. But to this (Church) "the plenitude of power so belongs that it admits the other "churches to a participation in its care. With heart and voice "we confess that which the Sacred and Holy Roman Church "truly holds, and faithfully teaches and preaches."[79] The *Council of Florence*, A.D. 1439, continues in the same strain in the *Decretum Unionis:* "We define, that the Roman Pontiff is "Successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and true "Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the "Father and Doctor of all Christians; and to him in Blessed "Peter was delivered, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the plenary "power of feeding, ruling and governing the Universal Church, "as it is also contained in the acts of the Oecumenical Councils "and the Sacred Canons."[80] The *fifth Lateran Council* A.D. 1520 [Bulla: *Exurge Domine*] condemned the proposition:

78 Hefele V. p. 882.

79 *Professio Fidie* in Concilio Lugdun. See Hefele, vi. 122, s. 18:

80 Hefele, vii. 745. 753. See Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 890.

"The Roman Pontiff, the Successor of Peter, is not the Vicar "of Christ constituted by Christ Himself in Blessed Peter over "all the Churches of the whole world." The same Council, four years previously, had laid it down that "only the Roman "Pontiff, for the time being, had authority over all the Councils, "and the full right and power to call them together, to transfer "or dissolve them, as is clear from the testimony of Scripture, "the sayings of the Fathers and the Roman Pontiffs our prede-"cessors, the decrees of the Sacred Canons and the confession "of the Councils themselves."[81] The Papal system, therefore, as it is called in opposition to the episcopal system of the Council of Basle and Constance, had gained the victory all over the Church. The *Council of Trent* made no definitions concerning the nature of the Church, partly because the Fathers could not agree upon the precise formulation of the doctrines and partly because they found that the definition of Florence was sufficient for all purposes. In four places, however, it describes the Roman Church as "*Ecclesiarum omnium Mater et Magistra.*" Criminal causes against bishops involving deposition or deprivation were reserved to the judgment of the Apostolic See. The Papal confirmation of the Council was solicited and given. The creed of the Council contains the following words: "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman "Church as the Mother and Teacher of all the churches, and "I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, "the Successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of "Christ."[82]

32. Finally the *Council of the Vatican*, A.D. 1870, has summed up the entire previous tradition of the Church concerning the Papal Primacy and has, moreover, declared its true and genuine sense. Starting from the Primacy of Peter it defines (a) that it was one of real jurisdiction over the whole Church; (b) that it was immediately and directly promised

81 See Denzinger, *Enchiridion* No. 622. 649.

82 *Sess. xxiv.* De Reform. c. 1. See also Manning: *The Oecum. Council and the Infall. of the Rom. Pontiff*; a Pastoral Letter to the Clergy. London 1869, p. 69

and given to Blessed Peter, in what we have called the Petrine texts. It rejects the perverse opinion of those "who while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, deny that Peter "in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, "whether taken separately or together, was endowed by "Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or "of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on "Peter as her minister.'"[83] In the second chapter the Council goes on to declare that the Primacy of Peter was instituted in *perpetuity* "to secure the perpetual welfare and "lasting good of the Church;" and that Peter's successors are the bishops of the Roman See. "For none can doubt, "and it is known to all ages, that the Holy and Blessed "Peter, the Prince and Chief of the Apostles, the pillar of "the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church . . . lives, "presides and judges, to this day and always, in his successors, the bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was "founded by him and consecrated by his blood. . . Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every particular church—that is to say, the faithful throughout the "world—should agree with the Roman Church, on account "of the greater authority of the princedom which this has "received; that all being associated in the unity of that See "whence the rights of communion spread to all, might grow "together as members of one Head in the compact unity of "the body. If, then, any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that Blessed "Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the "Primacy over the Universal Church, or that the Roman "Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter in this Primacy; "let him be anathema."[84] In the third chapter the Council proceeds still more fully to explain the *nature* and

83 *Constit. Dogmat. de Eccles.*, cap. I. (Card. Manning's Transl.)

84 *Ibid.* cap. II.

character of the Primacy. In the first place, the Pope's supreme power, it says, is an *ordinary* power over all other churches; it is a truly *episcopal* and an *immediate* power, so that all members of the Church, "both individually and collective "ly, are bound by their duty of hierarchical subordination and "true obedience" to submit to it in all matters of discipline and government as well as in faith and morals. In the second place, this supremacy of the Pope, it says, is in no way prejudicial "to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal "jurisdiction, by which bishops, who have been set by the "Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, "feed and govern each his own flock, as true Pastors, that this "their episcopal authority is really *asserted*, *strengthened* and "*protected* by the Supreme and Universal Pastor. . ." Lastly, the Council deduces from these data the right of free and independent communication with all the faithful of the world, and the right of all to appeal to its judgment, from which there is no appeal. It thus concludes: "If then any shall say that "the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of *inspection* or *direc*"*tion*, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the "Universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith "and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline "and government of the Church spread throughout the world; "or assert that he possesses merely *the principal part*, and not "all the fulness of this supre power; or that this power "which he enjoys is *not ordinary and immediate*, both over "each and all the churches, and over each and all the Pastors "and the faithful; let him be anathema."[85]

33. Instead of any reflections* of our own we shall con-

85 *Ibid* cap. III.

* One reflection, however, may not be out of place here. There are those who maintain that the Papal system is not founded upon Scripture and Apostolic Tradition, but is a later overgrowth in the constitution of the Church. And there are others who while maintaining the contrary, yet defend their position in such a way as to deny all growth and development, whether practical or theoretical. The truth, as has been shown in the present and previous chapters, lies in the mean. The real point at issue, which the defenders of the

clude this chapter with the words spoken by S. Anselm, Primate of Canterbury, in an assembly of Peers Spiritual and Temporal: "Since you, who call yourselves the Christian flock, and you "who call yourselves the princes of the people, give me, who "am your superior, no other but arbitrary and human advice, "I shall take refuge with the Chief Shepherd, the Prince of the "world, the Angel of Great Counsel in what concerns my "affairs or rather those of Him and His Church. Whatever "counsel He will give, I shall follow. He said to Peter, the "Prince of the Apostles: Thou art Peter, etc. Then He also "said to the other Apostles in common: He that heareth you, "heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. As "He spoke those words chiefly to Peter and in him to all the "Apostles, so likewise have they reference first to the successor "and in him to all the bishops as successors of the Apostles. "Not to an Emperor or King or Duke or Count has the "administration of the Church been committed. But inasmuch "as we are to be subject also to civil Rulers, the same Angel "of Great Counsel has said: Render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's, "and to God what is God's. This is the word of God, this "His counsel. To this I shall keep; this will guide me; "from this I shall not swerve in any way. Therefore hear you "all and each, that in the things of God I shall obey the successor of Peter, and in the things that belong by right to "the civil power of my Lord, the King, I shall, to the best of "knowledge and conscience, render faithful assistance." [86]

Papacy are able to prove, and its opponents unable to deny, is that the Papal power has grown *consistently*, and that the Catholic doctrines of the various ages concerning it, from the Gospels and S. Irenaeus down to the Vatican Council, are homogeneous. (Tr.)

86 Möhler, *l. c.* p. 91. [For other English testimonies to the Pope's supremacy see Cardinal Manning, *The Œcum. Council and the Infall.* 99 p. 73. 77. Also H. I. D. Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*, 3 Ed. p. 79-83. Tr.]

CHAPTER XIV.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

1.* It is one thing to say that the Pope as successor of S. Peter inherits the fulness of apostolic and ecclesiastical power, and quite another, to specify each and every right included in the power of his Primacy. This cannot be done by mere *à priori* inference. Experience alone will enable us us to form a true estimate. The power of the head of the Church, as we have repeatedly remarked, is a living force in a living organism. As the latter grows, and expands, as it maintains its life under ever-varying circumstances of time and climate, assimilating what is suitable, rejecting and eliminating what is hurtful, so also does the former grow and develope. The relation is aptly expressed in the following words of Schulte: "Supposing then that, for the "first thousand years, and even beyond, the Primacy or head-"ship of the Church had not visibly and prominently come to "the front, it would not matter in the least to one who is "resolved to view things impartially and reasonably; for it is "plain that Christ has not drawn up a charter of specific rights "to be exercised by the Roman Pontiff, but has given to the "Church a head with power to bind and loose in heaven and on "earth, to govern and rule the church, to take the place of "the Invisible Head. This being so, it is evident that from "such a position must needs flow each and every right that is "necessary, according to times and circumstances, for the

'government of the Church."[1] The Primacy of the Pope assumes one form in antiquity, another in the Middle Ages, and a different one, again, in the modern times. Nevertheless, despite the various forms and outward manifestations conditioned by time and circumstances, it is always the power of the Rock, of the Key-bearer, of the Chief Shepherd of the Church that is exercised. The main vital principle, the essential features and functions, included in the very idea of the Primacy and in the very nature of the Church, are always the same, and have been at all times recognised. To form a true and correct estimate of the Papal Primacy, therefore, both the dogmatic and the historic method must be employed.

Without the former we lose sight of the germ and root, that is, of the permanent element; without the latter, we forget its growth and development. But both combined will enable us to give a true, consistent, and fuller view of the doctrine, and to state it in terms more clear and precise than before. None but the blind can deny that there has been real development both in the exercise of the primatial power and also in its expression by Fathers and Theologians from the early ages down to the Vatican Council. With this Council the development has, we may say, reached a relative finality.

2.* What is true of the Papal Primacy in general, is equally true of Papal Infallibility in particular. For the latter is but a chief function of the Primacy itself. It is, in the first place, the Supreme Power of deciding questions of faith and morals; it is, secondly, the guarantee to the faithful that such decision is in absolute conformity with revealed truth. On the connection between the Pope's Primacy and his Supreme *Magisterium* the Vatican Council speaks thus: "And since by "the divine right of Apostolic Primacy, the Roman Pontiff is "placed over the Universal Church, we further teach and "declare that he is the Supreme Judge of the faithful, and

[1] Schulte, *System des Kirchenrechtes*, p. 191. *Lehrbuch des Kirchenr.* 2 Ed. Giessen 1868, p. 193. Hettinger, *Fundamental theol*, 2 Ed. p. 637.

"that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the "Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none "may re-open the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose "authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review "its judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who "assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the "Roman Pontiffs to an Oecumenical Council, or to an authority "higher than that of the Roman Pontiff."[3] It was in fact always held as self-evident that the gift of infallibility is attached to the supreme office of teaching in the Church. But it was less evident that the Pope was necessarily the Supreme Teacher, or, again, that, as the Primacy is a necessary postulate of the unity of the Church, so is Papal infallibility a necessary consequence of her immunity from error. It took a long time, and required a long process of elimination and assimilation, before this consequence was clearly seen by all, and was formally and finally declared by the Church. Nevertheless, the Church has all along acted upon it in times past; and she has acted upon it from no other reason than because she was conscious that such power was implied in the Petrine texts of Scripture. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is thus both old and new; it has lived from the beginning as a vital germ; it has expanded and developed in course of time, and according to the needs of the hour. Our simple duty, then, is to show that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as brought to light in course of time, and as finally formulated by the Vatican Council, is a *consistent* development, and a natural and necessary growth of the doctrine of Scripture and Tradition. Other specific powers included in the Primacy we may here pass over, leaving them to treatises on Canon Law, but the question of Papal Infallibility, because of its importance both intrinsic and extrinsic, more especially at the present

3 *Const. de Eccl.* cap. III. see Pii VI. *Breve* 'Super Soliditate,' Nov 28, 1786; *Epis.* Nicol. I. ad Mich. Imper. Hefele I. 144; II. 637, 639, 642, 645; III. 739; IV., 239, 336, 376, 456, 529, 547, 768.

day, requires a thorough dogmatic and historical examination at the hands of the Christian Apologist.

3.† Before proceeding, however, to the examination of the Scriptural doctrine, we deem it necessary to elucidate somewhat further the above mentioned connection between the Primacy and the Supreme power of teaching. For, it may be objected that the connection between the two is not self-evident The Primacy is a power of jurisdiction, a legislative and judicial power, while the power of teaching God's revealed word would seem to belong to a different order. Indeed the power of jurisdiction is necessarily limited to what are technically called the *subjects* of a ruler, but the teaching power of the Church extends to all men. Again, the power to teach is essentially a witnessing to what has been received and handed down; but the witnesses who are preordained by God and qualified for that office, are the bishops in virtue of their Episcopal character. For these and similar reasons, then, it is difficult to see, how the Supreme Magisterium is involved in the idea of the Primacy. The answer to this objection may be gathered from what has been said previously, especially in the fifth chapter. The power of teaching *within* the Church is decidedly a legislative function, or, an act of jurisdiction. The Church is a society whose first and fundamental law is the law of truth and faith; it is the society of the *faithful*, the community and body of believers; whose common faith is the first and chief bond of unity. The teaching of the Church, therefore, must come home to all its members by way of a real law,—which shall be emphatically *the* law. The supreme authority of the Church is answerable for the promulgation and execution of this law; and her subjects are bound to obey it in both cases. The case of those who are not yet subjects of the Church is different. For them the Church is indeed the only authorized and divinely commissioned promulgator of the divne law of truth, that is, of revelation, and so far her preaching is an act of jurisdiction; still it is not a perfect act of jurisdiction, properly so called,

necessarily supposing their formal membership and obedience. As regards the other portion of the difficulty, namely, that the teaching power would seem to be an *actus ordinis* rather than *jurisdictionis*, the answer is that it is really a complex power, belonging both to order and to jurisdiction. We have already explained (Chap. v.) that the power of order is perfectly sterile in the Church without the power of jurisdiction. The testimony of bishops deprived of jurisdiction, or independent of him in whom alone resides the Apostolic jurisdiction in the Church, is null and void. True, in virtue of the Episcopal character they are divine organs of truth, and duly accredited witnesses; but only as long as they are in the Apostolic succession, in the unity of the body corporate, that is to say, in subjection to him who is the one Apostle, living for evermore. Thus the power of teaching, even by way of witness, is and remains, in its ultimate analysis, an act of Apostolic jurisdiction. This being so, it is evident that the power of teaching revealed truth, or of laying down the law of faith, is not only intimately connected with the Primacy, but is really its chief and highest function. And, indeed, when we come to consider the testimonies of the early Fathers such as Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Optatus, it is principally in questions of faith that we see them appeal to the Roman Primacy, and regard its judgment as decisive.

I. EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE.

4. The proof from *Scripture* has to be sought above all in the Petrine texts. In Matthew XVI. 16-19, Peter is promised to become the unshaken rock of the Church, to possess the keys of the kingdom of heaven, so as to be able to bind and loose both on earth and in heaven. That the Primacy, or supreme power of jurisdiction, is promised in these words has been shown in chapter XII. But the supreme power of teaching is a necessary and chief part of that Primacy. The true faith is quite as much a vital condition and a fundamental law of the Church, as it is the root of justification in the individual

soul. Revealed truth, and a corresponding faith therein, are the well spring of her very life and existence. Therefore, if by the words of our Lord, there is conveyed any power at all, it must be the power of laying down the law of truth. Again, the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as even our adversaries admit, certainly comprises the power of teaching, the *clavis scientiae.* Of what kind and character this teaching is, we learn from the same text. Peter's binding and loosing on earth is said to be *sanctioned and ratified in heaven;* that is to say, it has divine force. His power of teaching, then, is as firm and unshaken as a rock which is proof against all hostile elements of assault from without or of dissolution from within. There is no deadlier enemy of the Church, nor of the whole economy of revealed truth, than heresy; whence the Fathers often interpret the gates of hell as heresies. But to say that Peter's power of teaching is as firm as a rock and sanctioned in heaven, is the same as saying that it is unerring or infallible. This gift of inerrancy can only come to him from God. Hence our divine Lord, in His admirable wisdom, has so disposed of events that the very act of promise should be accompanied by a signal instance of special divine assistance vouchsafed to Peter. "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because *flesh and* "*blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in* "*heaven*" (Matth. XXVI. 17).

5. The passage in S. John XXI 15-17, likewise, implies the supreme power both of teaching and of teaching infallibly. "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," is the charge given to Peter and his successors for ever. Now, the chief food for the Christian soul is divine truth, which it appropriates by faith. Faith is the light of the mind, and that light is as necessary to the spiritual life of the soul as is the material light to the life of organic beings. Peter, then, as chief shepherd, is commissioned by our Lord, in His name and place, to lead all that are of the flock into the green pastures of divine truth, and to the pure streams of divine grace. He, the good shep-

herd, will keep them away from the poisonous food of heresy, error and falsehood. Thus, the metaphor of feeding the sheep and lambs is not only in itself naturally most apt to express the supreme magisterium, but it is, moreover, biblical in usage. But besides this, the very nature of the subject of which the words treat, requires the text to extend to the power of teaching. Now the power of feeding the sheep, always and at all times, with genuine wholesome food, is, by implication, equivalent to saying that it can never err The power given to Peter is divine, and is directly the magisterial power of Christ. How can that power be fallible? How can the good Shepherd be the wolf? Peter enjoys the privilege of divine assistance, because he wields a divine power. Most significant, therefore, in this connexion is his wonderful confession of love. The love now filling the heart of Peter is not that natural affection upon which he relied before, and which proved weak in the hour of trial; it is a supernatural love, a divine gift, and therefore firm as adamant, and stronger than death. The more one dwells on the two texts of Matthew and John, the more is he sensible of the sweet and wonderful wisdom with which the Incarnate Word ordained the Church's constitution. Peter strong in faith is promised the Primacy; Peter strong in love receives the Primacy. Faith destroys heresy, love destroys schism. Peter is the source of the unity of truth and the unity of love. But this double unity comes ultimately from one and only source, namely, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of unity. That the Fathers have understood both passages, Matthew XVI. and John XXI., of the teaching power of Peter,* and that the Roman Pontiffs have ever *acted* upon it, is undeniable. S. Leo says: "I am mindful that I preside over the "Church in the name of him, whose confession was praised by "the Lord Jesus Christ, and whose faith destroys all heresies, "but especially the impiety of the present error,"[1]

1 *Ep.* 61. 2.
* See Allnatt, *Cathedra Petri*, pp. 1-39.

3. There remains the special passage of S. Luke XXII. 31 32, in which, as we have argued above, the promise of the Primacy is repeated in the face of an impending trial, and this time the promise conveys the assurance of infallible and indefectible faith. "*And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath "desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have "prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou being once "converted, confirm thy brethren.* The Council of the Vatican refers to it in the following words: "And indeed all the venerable "Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox Doctors have "venerated and followed their Apostolic doctrine; knowing "most fully that this See of Holy Peter remains for ever free "from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of "the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and, when thou "art converted, confirm thy brethren."

It has been said that this is the only Scripture passage on which Papal infallibility rests, and with which it stands and falls. This is not true. In the traditional view it rests quite as much on the text of S. Matthew and S. John as on that of S. Luke; and the Vatican Council bases it on all the three texts, as any one may see from the fourth chapter of the *Constitutio de Ecclesia*. As regards the exegesis of the passage, we refer the reader to our remarks in chapter XII. We have only to add a word concerning the terms ἐπιστρέψας *(converted)* and τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου *(thy brethren)*. Some have thought that the former word might be a hebraism, and have the meaning of '*vicissim (in turn*, or, *again)* like the Hebrew verb '*shub*.'[4] This, however, is very doubtful, as the Hebrew '*shub*' seems only used in that sense when the same identical action is repeated by the same, or sometimes even by a different agent (Jerem. XVIII 4. Ezech. VIII. 5. Ps. LXX. 20. 21; LXXXIV. 7. IV Kings XXIII. 16. Deut. III. 1. I Mach. XII. 45. Cf. Acts XV. 36.) The word 'fratres' is often used in Scripture of the '*faithful*';[5]

4 See Schanz, Comment. in Luc. p. 517.
5 Matth. xxiii. 8. John xxi. 23. Acts vi. 3; ix. 30, and many other passages.

but S. Paul uses it also of his fellow-labourers.[6] Peter, therefore, receives the promise that his faith will be strong by the grace of God—(the effect of Christ's special prayer), and that he is to strengthen the faith of his fellow-labourers and fellow-believers. This duty of supporting the faith of his brethren is a lasting one, as is clear from the nature of the case, and from the parallelism of this passage with Matthew XVI. The attempts of Satan to sift as wheat those who are disciples of Christ, are not limited in time and place; the brethren will need strength at all times; the unity and solidity of faith requires care and safeguarding in every age. It is the peculiar work and merit of Christ's prayer, passion and death, to make efficient provision for the Church. Therefore He built it upon the immovable rock. We know that our adversaries find fault with what they are pleased to call 'infallibilistic logic,' and 'wholesale inferences.' But we would venture to ask, are these inferences not obvious, natural, and necessary? Infallibilistic or no, is it logic? Is it the logic of facts? What else is development but the logic of events? Let us hear Döllinger. "The chair of Peter," he says, "was to be a stronghold of truth, a fortress of faith for "all. For, the words and prayers of our Lord had reference "not only to one person and to the immediate future, nay "rather, they were meant to lay the foundation of an edifice, "they were meant above all for the Church, and all her future "needs, as He foresaw them in spirit. Spanning all future "times with His divine eye, He prays for the unity of the "members of the Church, in order that this unity may be an "everlasting testimony of his divine mission.[7]

7† These words of Döllinger point out to us a further argument from Scripture. There are two facts that stand out very clearly in the pages of Holy Writ. The first is, that Christ made special prayer at the last supper for the unity of the Apostles among themselves and among them and those that were to

6 I Cor. i. 1; II Cor. i. 1; ii. 12. Ephes. vi. 21. Col. i. 1.

7 *Christenthum*, p. 32. See Scheeben, i. 100.

believe through their word. "As Thou hast sent Me into the "world, I also have sent them into the world. And *for them* "do I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth. "*And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through* "*their word shall believe in Me.* That they all may be one, as "Thou, Father in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may "be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast "sent Me." (John XVII. 18-21). The second fact is, that this prayer of Christ's is made efficacious by the sending of the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth who will teach them all things and who will abide with them for ever. (John XIV. 16-17; XV. 2˝. 27). The Apostles shall receive His own Spirit, and shall be divine witnesses to His truth until the end of time. (Matth. XXVIII. 20). Now what else does this mean but that the Apostolate is infallible in its teaching and that it will last till the consummation of the world? But the Apostleship in its full and proper sense survives in none but the Bishop of Rome. It is eve lasting in Peter, and in him alone. Hence, at the last supper, our Lord made the same prayer, first and especially, for Peter: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Langen[8] is consequently very much mistaken, if he thinks that the prayer recorded by John (XVII. 18-21) finally disposes of the application of infallibilistic logic to the prayer in S. Luke (XXII. 31. 32). The two prayers not only stand well side by side, but they mutually complete each other. No one can fail to see this, except those who imagine that the infallibility of the Church is distinct and different from that of Peter.

Our position, then, is clear. In saying that there is Scripture proof for the infallibility of the Pope, we do not mean that Papal Infallibility, by a mere process of logic, and independently of the historic development which finally issued into the definition of the Vatican Council, can be inferred from the texts of Scripture. This is rather the attitude which our opponents assume. They seem to argue that, because Papal infallibility is not set forth in formal and explicit terms, there is

8 *Unfehlbarkeit*, p. 18.

no proof for it whatever. We maintain, on the contrary, that we have, in Scripture, the main and essential principle, the vital germ; and that, as time went on, this grew and expanded naturally and consistently; that it came more and more distinctly into view, and that it was apprehended and formulated as a speculative truth in exactly the same degree as it grew in practical development. Thus, our logic of reason is but the reflection of the logic of facts. To deny that Papal infallibility, as defined by the Vatican Council, has not its germ and root in Scripture, is to be blind both to Scripture and historical Tradition. Scripture gives us a principle. The Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and during the progress of the ages, draws the conclusions, and draws them, be it noticed, not from one principle by itself, but from the comprehensive consciousness of all the principles that make up the Catholic deposit.

8. We have still to consider the *Patristic* interpretation of the passage in S. Luke XXII., 31, 32. The Fathers are wont, especially in their homiletic interpretations, to seek the practical lessons contained in a text rather than the dogmatic and doctrinal which they take for granted when speaking before the faithful. Thus in our text they would dwell upon the power of prayer for preserving the faith, or, again, upon perseverance under temptation, or, again, upon the necessity of grace for believing. *Ambrose* is the first in whose writings we find the text explained with reference to Peter's Primacy. He says: "Finally, Peter is placed over the Church, after "having been tempted by the devil. Whence our Lord "signified to him beforehand what it would mean when after- "wards He would make him Shepherd of the flock. For He "tells him: And thou, etc., S. Peter, therefore, was converted "and had been sifted as wheat so as to become, with the "Saints of God, *one* bread that would serve us as food. For "while we read the actions of Peter, we recognize his precepts,"[9]

[9] In Ps. xliii. 42. Chrysost; *Homil* i. 5. See Langen. p. 78; ii. 79. Theodor. *De Div. Carn.* (Migne, p. 1508).

"and he becomes our food for life and salvation." Similarly S. *Chrysostom* explains that by his fall S. Peter had to learn how to be forgiving and merciful to others. For by the word "confirm" the Lord signified to him that he was "to con-"descend to the wavering, and strengthen them; that he was "to offer them his hand, and show them much love." *Theodoret* also thinks that Peter's trial was prophetical of his office, in as much as he was to be the column of support for a tottering world, giving strength to the waverers. But it was chiefly Peter's own successors that drew out the full import of the passage. *Leo the Great* combines the two passages from Luke XXII. and John XXI. to establish the position of the Roman bishop. "If anything," he says, "is administered well "by us, if anything is rightly ordained, it must be considered "the work and ruling of him to whom it was said: And thou, "once converted, confirm thy brethren." "The danger was "common to all the Apostles . . . yet Christ has special "care of Peter; He specially prays for the faith of Peter, as "though the position of the others were secure, if Peter's spirit "remained unconquered. In Peter, therefore, the strength of "all is assured, and the assistance of divine grace is so disposed "that the strength which Christ imparts to Peter is through "him imparted to the Apostles." And having quoted John XXI. 17, he adds: "This he undoubtedly continues to do up "to now; the faithful Shepherd fulfils the charge of our Lord, "he strengthens us by his admonitions." The Popes *Gelasius* and *Gregory the Great*, explain it in like manner; Gelasius adding that it was in the interest of the Church that *one* chair received pre-eminence above all the rest.[10] *Pelagius* II. (A.D. 580) says, that the prayer was made for the Apostolic Chair. Yet he is mindful, withal, of his own shortcomings, and excuses those of Vigilius. *Martin* I., and *Vitalian*, follow in the same track. *Agatho* writes: "Be mindful, therefore, that the Lord

10 Leo, *Sermo* iv. (iii.), 3; lxxxiii. (lxxxii.), 3. Gelas., *Ep.* v. 14. Pelag., *Ep.* v. 4. Bossuet, *De Summi Pontificis Auctor.* c. 7.

"who promised that Peter's faith should not fail, exhorted "him to confirm his brethren, and this, as is acknowledged "on all sides, my predecessors have always done." So unanimous is the consent of the Fathers upon the interpretation of this passage that even *Bossuet* drew from it his proof for the unchangeable faith of the Roman See.

9.† Cardinal Manning thus sums up the evidence: "The "application of the promise *Ego rogavi pro te, etc.*, to the "infallible faith of Peter and his successors, is made by S. "Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Leo, S. Gelasius, Pelagius II., "S. Gregory the Great, Stephen, Bishop of Dori, in a Lat-"eran Council, S. Vitalian, the Bishops of the IVth Oecu-"menical Council, A.D. 481, S. Agatho in the VIth A.D. "680, S. Bernard A.D. 1153, S. Thomas Aquinas A.D. 1274, "S. Bonaventure A.D. 1274: that is, this interpretation is "given by three out of four Doctors of the Church, by six "Pontiffs down to the seventh century. It was recognized "in two Oecumenical Councils. It is explicitly declared "by the Angelic Doctor, who may be taken as the exponent "of the Dominican School, and by the Seraphic Doctor, "who is likewise the witness of the Franciscan; and by a "multitude of Saints. This *catena*, if continued to later "times, might, as all know, be indefinitely prolonged."*

II. EVIDENCE OF TRADITION IN THE FIRST SEVEN CENTURIES.

10. From the texts quoted in the preceding chapters we are already sufficiently familiar with the traditional view generally taken of the Roman Church. As the Apostolic See and the chair of Peter she holds a pre-eminent position in all questions of importance to the universal Church, and especially in controversies of faith. Rome took the lead, as is clear from the history of the heresies of the second and third centuries. No other Bishop dealt with heretics, no matter from which quarter they came, as the Roman Bishop dealt with them and they with

* *The Vatican Council and its Definitions.* A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy. London, 1870, pp. 80-84.

him. But in the present chapter we have still to enquire, in a special manner, how this ancient and general tradition bears upon our particular question of Papal infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council. That Papal infallibility was *de facto* assumed by the Popes and practically acted upon in the Church, is unmistakable from many examples and testimonies, especially from the words of Leo the Great.[11] Nevertheless, the *formal* proof of the dogma as defined by the Council is not without some difficulty. Two faults have to be equally avoided: to exaggerate the historical evidence, and to underrate it. For this purpose it is absolutely necessary to keep steadily in view the precise state of the question. The remarks which we have made concerning the evidence from Scripture, equally apply in their measure to the evidence from Tradition. The dogma itself is substantially as old as the Church; for it is a divine prerogative conferred by Christ at the foundation thereof. But in form and aspect it is also new, like other articles of faith; for this divine prerogative was given to men to do a work in the world and in time, and according to the needs of each epoch; hence it came to light gradually, it grew and expanded; it came to be seen in its relation to other factors and elements in the organism of the Church; it gained, as time went on, in clearness, distinctness, and strength, until at last it took its true and natural place among the explicit articles of the Catholic faith. There are those who speak and argue, at times, as if Papal infallibility had been taught as clearly and distinctly in the third century as in the nineteenth. They surely overstate the facts of history, and forget the law of development in Christian dogma. There are others who look upon the Vatican definition as a triumph of dogma over history. But these underrate the facts, and exaggerate the functions of history. The Catholic Apologist steers, as is proper, a middle course. The Church is both divine and human; it is dogmatic and historical. The Vatican definition is both a triumph of

11 *Ep.* civ. 1; cxx. 1.

dogma, and of history. We cannot do better here than quote the words of Cardinal Manning on this subject.[18] He says: "Men, too hot headed to be candid or too light headed "to be accurate, have called this the triumph of dogma over "history. Some have even said, with less honour, that to "appeal to history is here denounced as heresy. Not so fast. "To appeal from a human teacher to human history is no "heresy; but to appeal from a Divine Teacher to any other "tribunal is *ipso facto* heresy. This clause, however, is always "carefully suppressed. The objectors conceal the fact that "they do not believe in any divine authority. They therefore, "in contradicting their Church and all its teachers, commit "neither treason nor heresy. Where there is no supreme "authority, there is no treason; and where there is no divine "teacher, there is no heresy."

"The triumph of dogma over history, therefore, really means "this: the Church defines its doctrines in spite of you, because "it knows its history better than you. Its dogmas include its "history, and its history is part of its consciousness, sustained "by divine assistance. If you would deny the conclusion, you "must deny the premises; that is, the Divine assistance which "perpetuates the faith."

"History does not mean only books, manuscripts, documents "and scientific historians. It means also the moral personality "of Empires and Kingdoms: the living and ever accumulating "tradition of human action and human knowledge embodied "in usages, customs, laws, institutions All these are witnesses, "and testify with articulate voice. The history of the Church "is the Church itself; its world-wide circumference guarded by "the universal Episcopate, and its centre the fountain of sup-"reme authority; its unbroken succession of Bishops in all "nations; its lineal inheritance of the Primacy of the chief "of the Apostles; its nineteen Œcumenical Councils: all these "things are history, historical documents, testimonies, records

18 *Religio Viatoris*, pp. 78-82.

"and living witnesses. To quote human and uninspired texts "against the voice and witness of the universal Church, is "no sign of common sense. The scientific historian reads the "history of the Catholic Church in one sense, the Catholic "Church reads its own history in another. Choose which you "will believe. For me it is enough to say in matter of its "history what St. Augustine said in matters of faith: *Securus* "*judicat orbis terrarum.*"

"When our Lord said to Peter, 'Satan hath desired to have "you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, "that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm "thy brethren,'* He foretold that there should be for ever a "warfare against the faith. When He said, "the gates of Hell "shall not prevail," He implied, that they should be in "perpetual assault."

"Nevertheless there has been an unbroken tradition of "immutable faith, resting on the promise of divine assistance."

"In this doctrine also there have been three periods of "discussion, and analysis, and definition as to the mode of "conceiving and expressing the truth about which in itself there "was no doubt."

"1. The first, was a period of a simple unquestioning "belief that the successor of Peter had by divine promise a "special stability in faith."

"2. The second, a period of analysis and of controversy "provoked by the great western schism out of which came "Gallicanism within the Church and Anglicanism out of it."

"3. The third, a period of definition in which the simple "faith of the first period was defined with the precision of "thought and of words that the analysis of controversy had "attained."

"At the time of the Vatican Council the world achieved a "great victory. It prejudiced the minds even of good men, "it blinded their eyes and it made their ears deaf. They

* St. Luke xxii., 31, 32.

"would not listen, therefore they could not believe. And "they would not listen because they had no will to be con- "vinced and a wish rather not to be convinced; but this "will not be so for ever. At and after the Council of Nicæa "many died in the belief that the world had been divided "without need, and tormented for an iota. But we now "can see that the iota has saved the faith of the world. "We see also that the whole *Ecclesia Docens*, the universal "Episcopate represented by 700 of its members united to "their head, less only perhaps three, bore witness to the "infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. About forty thought "it inopportune to define the doctrine: but they all alike "submitted when it was defined, and the bishops who were "not present sent their adhesion."

"This world-wide unanimity is the past living in the "present, the history of the faith written on the living and "lineal intelligence of the Church: a living scripture of "the Spirit of Truth."

There is, then, historic evidence, sufficient from the beginning, and increasing with time, for the dogma of Papal infallibility. The Magisterium of the Church, as the living organ not of revelation, but of tradition, could not define a doctrine without historic evidence. Such inconsistency is impossible. But then the Church herself is at once the best, and the most authentic witness to her own history.

11. There is yet another remark with which we must preface our examination of the historic evidence for Papal infallibility. The early Fathers are accustomed to speak of the *Roman Church* rather than the Roman Bishop. *Her* faith is known and praised everywhere. *Her* faith is the rule for all the churches. With this *Church* all others must agree. This *Church* holds authority and principality. *She* presides in the covenant of love. *She* has the one chair of truth, to which no treachery of faith can have access. With *her* begins the unity of the priesthood. But it is clear that statements, like these, suppose that the cause and reason of the Roman Primacy is

known from the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. The words of the Fathers must be viewed in the light of the New Testament, in conjunction with the Petrine texts of Scripture, and with the whole organization of the Church. The reason of the superiority of the Roman communion or congregation lies in the superiority of her See, her Chair, her Episcopal Succession, in the fact that it is the See and Chair of Peter.

Irenæus clearly states the reason why the Roman Church preserves the Apostolic Traditions as she does; it is on account of the *succession of her bishops.*[13] Again *Cyprian* rebukes the heretics, because they ventured to send representatives to Rome to the Chair of Peter to carry letters from schismatics and profane (outsiders), forgetting that it is the Romans whose faith was praised by the Apostle and to whom no false faith (perfidia) has access. For there is but one Church, one Chair erected by the word of the Lord upon Peter. Whoever does not hold fast to this unity, how can he expect to keep the true faith? *Ambrose* exhorts the Emperor to call upon the head of the whole Roman world, namely, the Roman Church, that it should not allow the Apostolic tradition to be impaired; for from thence (Rome) flow the rights of the venerable community (Church) upon all. *Jerome* asks: "Which faith does "he call his? Is it the faith of which Rome is full? If so, "then we are both Catholics." "Remember, we have nothing "so much at heart as to preserve the rights of Christ, and not "to transgress the limits traced by our fathers, and to be ever "mindful of the Roman faith which was already praised by the "mouth of the Apostle." If to this we join his words addressed to Pope Damasus already quoted, we gather that the Roman Church is the sure and unfailing seat of truth, because her Bishop is the successor of Peter. In his letter to Demetrias he praises Pope Anastasius as a man of truly Apostolic poverty and zeal, who has crushed the head of the

13. *Adv. Haer* III. 3, 2. Cypr. *Ep.* lix. 14; xliii. 5. *De Unit.* c. 4. Ambr., *Ep.* xi. 4. Hieron, *Adv. Ruf.* i. 4. *Ep.* lxiii. Cf. *Ep.* xv., 1, 4. *Ad Demetr.* cxxx.

dragon (heresy) and shut up the mouth of the hissing serpent. Hence he exhorts her "to hold fast to the faith of Pope "Innocent who succeeds Anastasius in the Apostolic Chair."

12. S. *Augustine*, too, repeatedly gives expression to his inmost conviction that the true faith is always found in the Roman Church, and is never found outside her. For, "in this "chair of unity God has deposited the doctrine of truth." "Thou couldst not hope to hold the true faith of the Catholic "Church, unless thou didst teach that the Roman faith is to be kept." Nor must we think that he gives the palm to Rome only in questions of explicit and universally taught doctrines of faith. For when the *new* questions* of faith arose, concerning grace, he forwarded his treatises against the epistles of the Pelagians to His Holiness in Rome in order that, whatever was wrong or displeasing, might be corrected there. And when Innocent I., A.D. 417 had sent his final answer to the African bishops, Augustine says: "Two councils have now been sent "to the Apostolic See, and Rescripts have come back from "there. The matter is ended. Would God the error ended "also." Again in his work on the utility of belief he says: "Not to yield to the authority of the Apostolic See, is a sign "either of the highest impiety, or, of froward arrogance."† "Christians are not allowed to doubt of the word of Zosimus "the Sovereign Pontiff." These and similar statements of the African Doctor are equivalent to a profession of Papal infallibility. Furthermore, by his general doctrine that the validity of the Sacraments is independent of the personal character of the dispenser, he has supplied us with the principle of distinguishing between the personal faith and the official infallibility of the Pope as the authentic witness and interpreter of Tradition.[14]

14 *Sermo* cxx. (Mai, *Nov. Bibl.* I. 273). *Ep.* cxciv., 1; cv. 16. *Sermo* cxxxi. 10. *Ep.* cxc. 6, 23. liii. 1, 3.

* *Nova* quaedam haeresis inimica gratiae Christi contra Ecclesiam Christi conatur exurgere; *sed nondum evidenter ab Ecclesia separata.* *Ep.* 178 ad Hilar. *Ep.* n. 1.

† *De Util. Cred* c. xvii. n. 35.

13.* The *Greek* Church, likewise, from the beginning, looked upon Rome as the immovable centre of the Catholic faith. *S. Ignatius*, in tracing what we may call the diocesan principle of faith, has also traced the principle of faith for the Church at large. According to him the faithful must remain in the teaching of the Bishop [*in sententia Eipscopi*], because he remains in the teaching of the Apostles, and they in that of Christ, and He in that of the Father. Here we have a divine law, and a divine organism. This law must equally apply to the Church at large; and the more so, as the Saint not only speaks in the highest terms of the Roman Church, but calls her the *president of* [the covenant of] *love*, an expression which spontaneously recalls to our mind the scene on the lake: "Simon, lovest thou "me more than these . . feed my sheep." The principle of Ignatius cannot be gainsaid. The bishops must remain in *sententia Apostolorum*. But how can that be tested in the case of bishops who are not placed over their churches by the Apostles themselves, but only by their disciples? Of course, the Apostolic Bishops are in *sententia Apostolorum*; but, who are they? Is it Arius, Apollinaris, Nestorius? The test is Rome, the ever living Apostolic See of Peter. This is the meaning of προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης. *S. Clement* of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians, speaks and acts as one who is conscious that together with his episcopate the universal care of churches has devolved upon him. It is his duty and office to repair whatever loss there may be in the faith and Apostolic tradition of particular churches. In whatever way we view the words and action of Clement, there is only one satisfactory conclusion possible, namely, that the Roman See was the centre of unity, the remedy against heresy and schism. This is the view that Irenæus took of it. "In the time of this "Clement, no small discussion having occurred among the "brethren at Corinth, the Church of Rome despatched a *most* "*powerful* letter ('ικανωτάτην ραφήν) to the Corinthians, *exhort*-"*ing them to peace, renewing their faith*, and declaring the

"tradition which it had lately received from the Apos-"tles . ."* Hence Eusebius calls it a great and admirable letter, and both he and Dionysius testify that it was publicly read in the churches.* This is scanty evidence, we grant. But before the end of the second century we come to a witness, at once Greek and Latin, whose testimony stands out as a bright constellation illuminating the preceding as well as the following ages. We mean *Irenæus.* Here is his one, absolute, universal test of orthodoxy: "But as it would be too long to enumerate in this volume "the succession of all the churches, we yet put to confu-"sion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an "evil self-pleasing, by vain glory, or by blindness and per-"verse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings, [we do "this I say] by pointing to that tradition which the great-"est and most ancient, and universally known Church "founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious "Apostles Peter and Paul, has derived from the Apostles, "and [by pointing to] that faith which was announced to "all men, and has come down to us by means of the suc-"cession of the bishops. For with this Church, on account "of its pre-eminent authority, it is necessary that every "Church, that is, the faithful everywhere, should agree "(convenire); for in [communion with] her have the faith-"ful, that are everywhere, preserved that tradition which "is from the Apostles."* The true faith has to be sought at Rome; and it can always be found in the Roman Church. But this means that the true faith is taught by the Roman Bishop, because the Apostolic tradition, in the words of Irenæus, comes down to us by the succession of her bishops. "Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters "who are in the Church—those who, as I have shewn, pos-"sess the succession from the Apostles; those who, to-"gether with the succession of the Episcopate, have re-"ceived the certain gift of truth, according to the good

* *Adv. Haer.* III. 3. (Clark's Tr.).
* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 3. iv. 24.
* *Adv. Haer.* III. c. 2.

"pleasure of the Father; but to hold in suspicion others "who depart from the primitive succession, and assem-"ble themselves together in any place whatsoever, either "as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed "up and self-pleasing. . ."* The Roman Bishop, then, has the certain 'charisma veritatis,' as also the certain succession from the Apostles. In the faith and doctrine of the Apostolic See, so Irenæus tells us, there can be no error. Hence it is the one universal test of orthodoxy. The Vatican Council has said no more than Irenæus, as far as the substance goes. The Bishop of Rome, when defining a doctrine of faith and morals, has the 'charisma infallibilitatis.' It would be interesting to know whether those who reject the doctrine of the Vatican Council, are prepared to admit those clear and precise statements of Irenæus?

14. Not less distinct is the testimony of the Greek Fathers of the fourth century. *Epiphanius* says: "The Fa-"ther has revealed to him (Peter) His true Son and (the "Son) bestowed praise on him on this account; but the "revelation of Holy Ghost He (the Son) reserved to Him-"self. This was becoming for the first Apostle, the Rock "upon which the Church is built, and against which the "gates of hell cannot prevail. By the gates of hell must "be understood the heresies and heresiarchs. It was a "most wise disposition that the faith of him who has re-"ceived the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and who bind-"eth and looseth on earth and in heaven, should be made "sure. In him we may find represented all the subtle "questions of our faith."[15] Clearly this Father assumes the fact that Peter is still living, and that his faith is absolutely secure, when he acts in his capacity as rock and key-bearer, that is, as universal Teacher of the faithful.

Gregory of Nazianzum speaks thus of Rome: "As regards "her faith, Old Rome pursues the right path from the

15 *Ancor.* c. 9.

* L. c. iv. 26. 2.

"beginning till now, and she maintains the whole East in the "truth of salvation; and it is meet that she who is president "of the whole world, should religiously maintain the harmony "in the Church of God."* *Theodoret*, in his letter to the Roman Presbyter Renatus, expresses himself in less chosen terms, but with equal force: "For that holy chair has the "primacy (hegemony) over the churches of the world, for "many reasons, but especially because it has remained "free from every foul odour of heresy, and no one has sat in it "who taught opposite doctrine. Whatever is decided by you "we shall accept, no matter what it may be, because we trust "in your judgment." In substance, then, these Fathers teach and assume as universally believed, first, that the Roman bishop, in his official capacity, cannot lead the faithful into error; secondly, that all churches and bishops have to abide by his doctrinal judgments; thirdly, that his prerogative belongs to him as successor of S. Peter, and is, therefore, the effect of a special divine assistance. *S. Ephrem* puts it admirably. Peter, he says, is a second Josue, who is assisted by his brethren in the building up of the Church, and who gives testimony for the brethren and the whole world. Again he says, we have the salt of the earth that can never lose its savour; the sun that is ever rising and never sets; that illuminates all that sit in darkness; the lamp that ever burns without being fed anew. "*The light is Christ, the lamp is* "*Peter, the oil is the assistance of the Holy Ghost.*" †

At the fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 649, Bishop *Stephen of Doori* thus spoke: "On account of the Primacy of the Roman "Church Archbishop Sophronius of Jerusalem sent me to Rome, "in order to report about and obtain the condemnation of the "errors of those men (Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, and Sergius).

* Gregor. Naz., *De Vita*, v. 562-672. The last words of the quotation are difficult to translate. The Greek runs thus: καθὼς δίκαιον τὴν πρόεδρον τῶν ὅλων—ὅλην σέβουσαν τὴν θεοῦ συμφωνίαν.

† Theodor. *Ep.* cxvi. Ephrem., *Encom. in Petr.*

"He obliged me by solemn oath on Mount Calvary to do this, "and I have faithfully carried out his orders. To-day I appear "for the third time before the Apostolic See to ask that those "errors may be refuted. . . God raised anew Pope Martin, "who has called together this synod for the preservation of the "dogmas."[16] And *Maximus*, Abbot of Chrysopolis, says: "All the countries of the earth . . keep now their eyes "steadily fixed upon the most holy Roman Church, upon her "confession and faith, as upon the sun of eternal light, "expecting that from her will break forth the resplendent light "of the doctrine of the Fathers and Saints, laid down in the "six divine, holy and God-enlightened Councils."

15. But the great witnesses to the rights and privileges of the Apostolic See are the *Popes* themselves. The saying that no one is judge in his own cause does not apply here. A prophet knows best what a prophet is; and in like manner the Pope, or bishop, or priest understands best his own dignity, which God has conferred upon him. Bossuet justly remarks that God, in placing a man in a high position, inspires him at the same time with a true knowledge and appreciation of it. Moreover, the testimony of the Popes in our present case is all the less suspect, as it is borne out and confirmed by other independent testimonies, and because the claims of the Popes were then universally admitted. Now it is certain that the Popes have invariably claimed the right of infallibly deciding questions of faith. They have acted in accordance with this claim, and, as history tells us, Rome has ever been on the right side whether its utterances preceded or followed those of Councils. On this point we cannot do better than refer the reader to Hagemann's work, *The Roman Church*, while we confine ourselves to those formal testimonies in which this privilege is either asserted with more or less of explicitness or necessarily implied.

Pope *Julius I.* (A.D. 337-352), in his above-mentioned letter

16 Mansi, x. 891. Hefele, iii. 216.

to the Eusebians, says: "Are you ignorant that this has been "the custom of the Church, that, first of all, letters should be "sent to us, that thus what is just may be decreed from this "place? If, therefore, any suspicion fell upon a bishop, it "would be right to apply to this Church. But now they who "informed us not, but left us ignorant of the course of events, "make themselves supporters of the suspicious views. Such "were not the ordinances of S. Paul, nor was it so handed "down to us by the Fathers. This is a form altogether strange, "and a new institution." Again he says: "What we have "received from blessed Peter that I declare unto you; nor "should I now write to you, except that those events have "caused us anxiety, because I believe that it is already known "to all." [17] Thus, in the middle of the fourth century and amidst the turmoil of the Arian controversy, the Pope appeals to the *well-known custom* of the Church, according to which questions and doubts concerning orthodoxy were to be referred to him, and declares that he would give to all what he had received from Peter. As a matter of course, the judgment of Peter was admitted to be final and infallible. In the same way *Innocent I.* (A.D. 417) praises the Africans, because, in cases of doubt, they addressed themselves to the Roman chair. "Quoties fidei ratio ventilatur, arbitror omnes fratres et "coëpiscopos nostros nonnisi ad Petrum, idest sui nominis et "honoris auctorem referre debere." [18] *Sixtus III.* (A.D. 433) writes to John, Patriarch of Antioch: "You have learnt from "the issue of this matter what it means to be of one mind "with us. The holy Apostle Peter has committed what he "had received to his successors. And who is there that would "separate himself from his doctrine whom the Master Himself "had taught as the first of all the Apostles?" And to Cyril of Alexandria he writes (A.D. 432): "Thus the Roman Church

17 *Epist. Jul. P. ad Euseb.* n. 22 (Coustant, p. 386). In Athanasii. *Apologia c. Arian.* c. 21-35. See also the remarks of Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 17, and of Sozomenes, *H.E.* iii. c. 10 on this letter of Julius.

18 Epist. xxx. c. 2 (Coustant p, 896).

"preserves unanimity as in the institution of the preacher—so "also in the preaching of the faith."

Leo the Great expresses the infallibility of the Roman See in equivalent terms, inasmuch as he claims for it indefectible stability of faith. "The firmness of that faith which was "praised in the Prince of the Apostles is an everlasting one; "and just as that which Peter confessed is lasting, so also that "which Christ has instituted in Peter." "Because that solidity "which Peter himself, when constituted the rock, received from "Christ, the principal Rock, has passed onward also to his "heirs and successors." The Roman faith, according to S. Leo, remains firm, certain, pure, unpolluted by error or heresy. It is always the faith and teaching of Peter the Apostle, to whom this indefectibility of faith was given by the prayer and power of Christ. *Peter Chrysologus*, in his letter to Eutyches, declares that without the consent of the Roman Bishop no questions of faith can be decided. What else does this mean, but that all decisions are uncertain, until the Chair of Peter has given its judgment? Again, how clear and bold is the challenge of *Felix II.* (A.D. 483), when he writes to the Emperor Zeno entreating him not to rend the seamless garment of our Lord, spared even by the soldiery. "Is it not," he says, "my faith which the Lord Himself has designated as the "only true faith, and which cannot be conquered by any "opposition; for to the Church founded upon my Chair the "promise was given that the gates of hell should not prevail "against her?" *Gelasius* holds that is it absolutely impossible for him to lead people into error, "because the glorious con- "fession of the Apostle is the root of pure faith, therefore the "Apostolic See must place its chief care in this that it be not "stained by any kind of wickedness or contagion. For should "such a thing happen, which may God avert, and which we, "indeed, confidently predict impossible, what further error "could we resist, and with what right could we demand convic-

"tion of others."[19] The teaching of the Roman See, according to this Pope, is simply without spot or wrinkle or any such like thing.

16. In the next century we have the celebrated profession of faith of Pope *Hormisdas* (A.D. 516) which was subscribed by 2,500 bishops, and acceptance of which was made a condition of admission to the VIIIth General Council. "Thou art "Peter, etc. . These words are confirmed by their effects; "*for in the Apostolic See religion has been always preserved "without spot. . . following in all things the Apostolic See, "and professing all its decrees,* I hope to be worthy to be in that "one communion with you which the Apostolic See enjoins, in "which is the perfect and true solidity of the Christian "religion."[20] Two points are urged in this profession of faith. First, the historical fact that religion, for the last five hundred years, has been kept inviolate in the Roman See; in other words, the teaching of the Roman Chair has been so far *de facto* infallible. Secondly, the cause and reason of this fact is said to lie in the promise made by our Lord to Peter; in other words, the teaching of the Roman See, being that of Peter, cannot be otherwise than infallible. Thus Papal infallibility, in matters of faith, is clearly proclaimed not only as a patent historical fact, but also as admittedly a dogmatic necessity. The fact that in the great controversies on points of faith, Rome was invariably on the right side, must needs be granted by those Protestants who still believe in the main doctrines of Christianity. But it is equally clear that the fact must be accounted for in some way or other. The choice lies between accident and necessity. With one voice antiquity has decided for the latter alternative, ever repeating the words of Christ: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my "Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This certainly, it must be confessed, accounts for the unique

19 *Ep.* xvi. 27; xlii. 2.

20 Hefele ii. 673. See also 694; iv. 388. Card. Manning, *The Œcum. Council*, etc., p. 86.

fact in a way that will satisfy the natural as well as the Christian mind. In the following century, again, this same appeal to history and doctrine is repeated with unabated vigour by Pope *Agatho* (A.D. 678-682). In his letter to Constantine Pogonatus occurs the following passage:—

"The true rule of faith is that which the Apostolic Church, "in good and evil fortune, has decreed and is defending; she "is the spiritual mother of our peaceful empire, the Apostolic "Church of Christ, of which, owing to the grace of God "Almighty, it will never be proved that she has deviated from "the path of Apostolic tradition, or that she has been depraved "by heretical innovations, and has yielded thereto, but as she "received the faith in the beginning of Christianity from her "authors, the Chief Apostles of Christ, so she preserves it "inviolate till the end, according to the promise made in the "Sacred Gospels to the Prince of His disciples: Peter, Peter, "behold Satan, etc."* These words embody the whole substance, and express by name the very elements, of the Vatican definition, namely, the subject, object, and cause of infallibility.

The subject is the Roman See, or, the Bishop of Rome; the object is whatever is matter of faith and Apostolic tradition; the cause is the grace of God, or, the special divine assistance of the Holy Ghost. The condition of infallibility is implied, namely, that the Pope must be acting as Supreme Teacher of the Church. We may add, moreover, a remark of Bishop Hefele upon this letter: "Three points," he says, "are "specially noticeable: (1) the confidence and clearness with "which Agatho declares the orthodox doctrine; (2) the zeal "with which he repeatedly expresses the infallibility of the

* "Quae [Ecclesia Romana] per Dei Omnipotentis gratiam a tramite Apostolicae "traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec haereticis novitatibus depravata "succubuit, sed ut ab exordio Christianae fidei percepit ab auctoribus suis "Apostolorum Christi Principibus illibata fine tenus permanet, secundum "ipsius Domini Salvatoris divinam pollicitationem, quam suorum discipulorum "Principi in sacris Evangeliis fecit: Petre, Petre, inquiens, etc., (Luke "xxii. 31· 32)

"Roman Church; (3) the emphatic assurance that all his pre-"decessors had held fast to the orthodox doctrine and had "given right directions to the Patriarchs of Constantinople. "Hence, Agatho was far from thinking Honorius guilty of heresy, "and the opinion that he consented by anticipation to his "condemnation, is entirely contradicted by this letter."[21]

Under the same Pope a *Roman Synod* was held, attended by 125 Western bishops who were unable to attend the VI. General Council (A.D. 680). In a letter addressed to the Emperor they express a hope that by his exertions "the light of "*our* Catholic and Apostolic faith may shine in the whole "world; that light which, emenating from the source of light, "has been preserved by the Chief Apostles, Peter and Paul, "by their disciples and Apostolic successors down to the "present Pope, and which had never been obscured by the "hideous darkness of heretical error." . . .[22]

The quotations we have given, to which many others might have been added, are more than sufficient to establish the fact that the Roman See claimed in theory and practice the right of teaching infallibly and deciding infallibly in matters of faith, and that this claim was universally admitted from the fourth to the seventh century.

17. But it is urged, the Popes generally decided questions of faith not by themselves, but in Synod; and therefore the infallibility, so far as it was ascribed to the Roman See, was at least dependent on, and conditioned by, synodal action. To this objection we reply, first, that there is no proof to show that all Papal decisions in matters of faith were given in Synod; on the contrary, from the Epistles of the Popes quite the opposite conclusion may be gathered. Augustine, certainly, did not think that Synods were either necessary, or were, as a matter of fact, always held. He says: "Or, indeed, was there "any need of the assembling of a Synod to condemn this open

21 Hefele iii. 257.
22 Mansi, xi. 286. Hefele, iii. 257.

"pest, as if no heresy could at any time be condemned except "by the Synodal meeting; when, on the contrary, very few "heresies can be found for the sake of condemning which any "such necessity could have arisen."[23] For this reason Leo the Great was averse, at first, to a General Council, because he thought the question, as to the two natures in Christ, sufficiently decided. In the second place, no Roman Synod attributed infallibility to itself, but traced it to the Apostolic Succession, that is, to him who sat in the Chair of Peter. Even the General Councils, as those of Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople, Nicaea simply accepted the judgment of the Pope as the voice of S. Peter.[24] Thirdly, the authors and leaders of heresy, as well as the defenders of the faith, appealed to the Pope in person, not to a Roman Synod.

18* What use, then, it may be asked, is there at all in Synods and General Councils? Is not the fact of their existence a clear proof against the personal infallibility of the Pope, although it be considered only as a prerogative of his office? Would not the history of the Church be a different one had there been the slightest suspicion in the early ages that the Bishop of Rome is by himself a source of infallible truth? (Hase).

Those who ask these questions clearly show that they do not understand the nature and function of the Apostolic Magisterium, whether exercised by the Pope or by a General Council. The questions might, perhaps, have meaning, or point, on the hypothesis that the Magisterium of the Church is an organ of revelation instead of tradition, or, again, that infallibility is a charisma *revelationis*, and not a charisma *assistentiæ divinæ*. We say *perhaps*, because even then it would not follow that Councils are useless. For, the Apostles enjoyed most certainly personal infallibility, and were organs of revelation, as well as tradition; yet they held a Council con-

23 *Contra Duas Epist. Pelag.* iv. 12, 34. Leo, *Ep.* xxxvii.
24 Hefele, iii. 263. 285. 462. 483; iv. 385. 423.

cerning a point of faith and discipline. But as a matter of fact the Popes and General Councils are not organs of revelation. Their infallible judgments and decisions are not sudden flashes of the mind, nor simple expressions of sovereign and arbitrary will. An *ex cathedra* decision is not *ex tempore* decision. The Apostolic Magisterium is essentially an organ of *tradition*. The Pope, and the bishops in union with him, and sharing in his Apostolic jurisdiction, are in the first instance *human witnesses* to what is contained in the Apostolic deposit as committed to the Church and handed down to them by tradition. They are, consequently, obliged to search and inquire, to infer and gather from tradition, present and past, what does and what does not belong to the Apostolic deposit. This in itself is a historical and human process of witnessing to the past. But in this process they are so assisted by the Divine Spirit that they can only arrive at an infallibly certain definite conclusion. The human certainty of their testimony is rendered absolute and divine by God's special assistance, but, in no wise, can the human testimony be dispensed with. Assistance implies something that is assisted. This is the human testimony based upon positive, historical, and humanly-verifiable data from Scripture and Tradition. Now it is perfectly plain that a General Council of those who are the appointed witnesses in the Church, will both facilitate and help to bring out, in its fullest force, the human testimony of the Apostolic Magisterium. A conciliary definition has thus a moral force of its own, and greater than that of a Papal definition wherein the human testimony does not shine out with the same lustre, though, in point of divine certainty arising from the divine assistance both definitions are absolutely alike. Both are divine testimonies. Moreover, in the definition of a Council we have not only an authoritative and infallible decision, but we have, at the same time, an assurance of its practical acceptance and adoption by the whole Church. Hence, a General Council, though not absolutely necessary, is yet, besides its many other advantages, a most

useful and efficacious means of infallibly deciding questions of faith. Nor does it follow because a Council confirms the sentence of a Pope, as at Ephesus and Chalcedon, that it considered the Pope's dogmatic decision as fallible; for we often find that subsequent Councils confirm preceding ones which were admittedly infallible. There is room for the double action, that of the head and that of the members; both are harmonious and mutually complementary one of the other. The Church follows the example of the Apostles in Council assembled. Peter gives his dogmatic decision; James arises to confirm it, and to prove that it is in harmony with the tradition of the Old Testament Revelation. We therefore fail to see why, on the hypothesis of Papal infallibility, the history of the Church should have been otherwise than it actually is.

19† But are there, then, two infallibilities and two infallible teachers in the Church? In what relation does Papal infallibility stand to that of the Church or General Council? It would seem, at the first sight, that there is what Theologians call a twofold *subjectum infallibilitatis*, because infallibility is claimed for the Pope by himself, and also for the body of bishops whether they define a doctrine of faith in solemn Council, or whether they propose it to the faithful simply by the unanimous teaching of their ordinary Magisterium. This, however, is but a mechanical view of infallibility which, on closer examination, is seen to have no foundation in reality. The attribute of infallibility directly and immediately belongs to the supreme power of teaching. The promise of infallibility is made to the *Magisterium Apostolicum*. But this supreme power of teaching with divine authority and divine certainty, although extended to many who are permitted to share it, is yet essentially one and indivisible. It is the same whether it manifests itself in the action of the head, or in the action of head and members combined; just as the human soul is one, whether it reveals its presence and power by one member, or by another, or by all at once. We may even press the analogy

still further, and say that as the action of the soul, revealed in one part of the body, implies, whether seen or not, a corresponding action in other parts, so also does the action of the Head of the Church imply a corresponding exercise on the part of the other members, and vice-versa. The Church is an organism, not a mechanism. The Episcopate, says S. Cyprian, is one, though there be many bishops. The Apostolic power is one, beginning in the head, and spreading over all the members joined to it; and it is this one Apostolic power of teaching that is infallible. Hence the Vatican Council defines that "the Roman Pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . is "possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer "willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doc- "trine regarding faith or morals . . ." Thus there is but one infallibility, as there is but one Magisterium and one faith.

20. But how, if it happened that, after due deliberation and examination at a General Council, it was found that a previous decision of a Pope was not in harmony with Apostolic and Catholic truth? The answer is simple enough from a Catholic point of view. Not every Papal decision is an ex cathedra definition even in matters of faith and morals. If therefore the case really occurred, it would mean one of two things: either that the previous decision was not ex cathedra, or that the discrepancy is not real but only apparent. Indeed when we come to examine the past history of the Church, there is only one instance which can be brought forward, with any show of reason, as a difficulty against the Catholic position. We mean the case of Pope Honorius, and his condemnation by a General Council. For the cases of Popes Liberius and Vigilius have no bearing whatever upon our present question, which is not whether a Pope can sin against faith, but whether he can err when as supreme head and teacher he freely and deliberately gives sentence upon a point of faith, with the manifest intention of making it binding upon the faithful at large.[25]

25 On the facts of the case of Liberius and Vigilius the reader may consult Bishop Hefele's *History of the Councils*, i. 681; ii. 825. 880. 905 (Germ. Ed.)

Now the history of *Honorius* is briefly this. The internal peace and unity of the Empire had been undermined by the prolonged controversies upon the person and nature of Christ, controvesies which, by the inevitable discussion and bitterness which they entailed, rendered the empire dangerously weak in the presence of enemies without. Hence the Emperor Heraclius was earnest to find a remedy. It was then that Sergius, the astute Patriarch of Constantinople, suggested the plan of gaining over Cyrus of Alexandria with the party of the Theodosians, by allowing his new doctrine and formula of *one will* and *one energy* in Christ. The plan was so far successful. But it met with stout opposition on the part of the orthodox, and especially of Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem. Whence it became necessary for Sergius to desist from pressing the new formula, and rather to advocate a policy of silence upon what he cunningly represented as a mere verbal dispute. In this sense he addressed a letter to Pope Honorius, describing in glowing colours the necessity of reunion and the great and immediate advantages that would accrue to the Eastern Church from his sanction of the policy of silence. Honorius (A.D. 625-638) not perceiving the snare laid for him by the wily Patriarch, writes back to him a letter wherein he mainly agrees with the policy of silence; explaining at the same time, that the expressions of one or two energies are unsatisfactory as savouring of Monophysitism and Nestorianism respectively, and that the whole matter was one of grammatical subtlety.[26] But as regards the formula of *one will*, he adopts it as being in harmony with Scripture and Tradition, from which we learn that there are not two contrary wills of Christ, as there are in us sinful men.

A fair and impartial perusal of his whole letter will convince the reader that Honorius did not hold any doctrine at variance with the Catholic faith, and, in particular, not the doctrine of the Monothelites.[27] On the other hand, it is equally clear

26 See Hefele, iii. 146.

27 *Ibid.* iii. 167.

that his confiding nature led him into a sad mistake, and that he, unwittingly, helped the cause of heresy, inasmuch as according to its false and perfidious character it would henceforth allege the explicit sanction of the Roman Pontiff.

We have next to see what impression his letter and mistake produced, when they were discovered, upon the Catholic world.

We find that John IV. (A.D. 641),[28] as well as Abbots John Samponus and Maximus defended his letter against the charge of erroneous doctrine. Pope Martin I., also, in his Lateran Synod (A.D. 649) does not name him among the Monothelites, neither does Agatho in his Roman Synod (A.D. 680). But in this very year, when the Sixth General Council asssembled at Constantinople, events seemed to have taken a new and different turn. The Monothelites, it appears, continued to shelter themselves not only behind the authority of Sergius and others, but also behind that of Pope Honorius. The Council was thus obliged to take notice of it; and it decided thus: "After reading the dogmatic epistles of Sergius "of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis, and to Pope Honorius, "as well as the letter of Honorius to Sergius, we find that "these documents are altogether at variance with the Apostolic "dogmas, the declarations of the holy Councils, and the "teaching of the most distinguished Fathers; and they follow "the false doctrines of the heretics. Hence we reject them "altogether and detest them as soul-destroying."[29] The Council then proceeds to excommunicate them by name, and thus continues: "Besides these, such is our unanimous "decree, there is to be excommunicated and anathematized "Honorius, formerly of old Rome, because we find in his "epistle to Sergius that he followed in his opinion and con-"firmed his impious doctrines." Later on, he is named again as among those who gave scandal in the Church by spreading

28 *Ibid.* iii. 169. Steutrup, *De Verbo Incarn.* i. 2, 850, *Kirchenlexicon*, vi. 233.
29 Hefele, iii. 263, 270, 276, 279, 283, 286, 289, 294.

the heretical doctrine of one will and one energy. The same charge is repeated in the letters of the Council addressed to the Emperor and to Pope Agatho. In his reply, confirming the Council, the Emperor says: "The heresy "of Apollinaris . . . has been renewed by Theodore of "Pharan, and confirmed by Honorius, who contradicted "himself." He then goes on to say that he "anathematizes "all heretics . . . also Pope Honorius, who was in all "things their follower and abettor, confirming their "heresy."

Pope *Leo II.* finally confirmed the Sixth Council, and "anathematized all heretics . . . likewise the authors of "the new doctrine . . . also Honorius, who did not light "up his Apostolic Chair by the doctrine of tradition, but "allowed (παρεχώρησε) the spotless faith to be undermined "by mean betrayal—and all who died in his error."

The same Pope writes to the Bishops of Spain that the above-named had been punished with everlasting condemnation—"Honorius, who did not, as became the Apostolic "Authority, extinguish the flame of heresy in the very "beginning, but fanned it by his negligence." And to King Erwig he writes: "And together with them Hono-"rius of Rome, who suffered the immaculate rule of Apos-"tolic tradition which he had received from his predeces-"sors to be stained." These, then, are briefly the facts of the case.

21. Catholic Apologists have tried many ways of meeting the difficulty that arises from the letter, and still more from the condemnation of Pope Honorius with regard to Papal infallibility. Some have called in question the genuineness both of the letter and of the acts of the Council;[30] but surely without sufficient ground. Others, again, with Garnier (died 1681), were of opinion that the Council had condemned Honorius' letter not as containing heresy, but as favouring it by neglect and want of perception. But this opinion, at

30 Piphius, Baronius, Damberger.

one time commonly held, has more recently been abandoned.[31] Pennachi especially showed that the Council had condemned Honorius as a heretic. His main proof consists in the comparison of all the passages bearing on the point from the Sixth Council, in its confirmation by the Council of Trullum (A.D. 692), and by the Seventh and Eighth General Councils, as well as by the wording of the oath which the Pope had to take, and which is contained in the *Liber Diurnus*.[32] Those favouring this opinion meet the difficulty against Papal infallibility by undermining the character of the General Council. Its decision, they say, rested on an error of fact; nor was it the decison of a General Council, but of an assembly of Eastern bishops; and though the Papal legates signed it, they had no commission to do so. The Pope, in confirming the Council, rectified their mistake.[33]

Others, finally, are of opinion that the whole question is solved by denying that the letter of Honorius was an ex cathedra statement. This, no doubt, is true.[34] At the same time it is going beyond the limits of historical truth to say that it was a mere private letter.[35] But the chief difficulty lies not in the letter, but in the condemnation of the Pope by the Sixth Council and its subsequent Papal confirmation.

22. The solution which best commends itself to our mind is that given by Bishop Hefele. Whatever may have been the intentions of the Council that formulated the condemnation, "Pope Leo II.," says Hefele, "couched the condemnation in "terms more precise and definite, and thus indicated the sense "in which the condemnatory sentence of the Council is to be accepted."[36] In this way the authority of the VIth Council is

31 Pennachi, Delicati, Palmieri. See Grisar, *Zeitschrift für Kathol, Theologie*, 1887, p. 675.

32 See Hefele, *l.c.* p. 295.

33 Grisar, *l.c.* p. 687.

34 Tournely, *De Eccl*, Q. 3, a. 4.

35 Gueranger, p. 94, 155. Schneeman, *Studien über die Honoriusfrage*, Freiburg, 1864, p. 63. Hettinger, *Fund. Theol.* p. 748. Grisar, *l.c.*

36 Hefele, iii. 299.

safeguarded, and Papal infallibility in ex-cathedra decisions remains untouched. Does it not speak well for the wisdom and infallibility of the Holy See, that it knew how to avoid the pitfall to which the sentence of the Council came so perilously near?

23. The subsequent course of history, moreover, shows that the mistake and condemnation of Pope Honorius were unable to shake the faith in the infallibility of the Apostolic See. The Metropolitans of Africa, in the name of the Councils, write to Theodore, third successor of Honorius, asking him to put an end to the Monothelite controversy; for "no one can doubt," they say, "that in the Apostolic See there flows a great and "inexhaustible spring which pours forth its waters upon all the "faithful, and whose rich streams irrigate the whole Christian "world. To this Apostolic Chair, in honour of S. Peter, the "Fathers in their decrees have ascribed especial authority in "matters of faith . . . here all other churches have to "seek the origin of doctrine, and thus, in all parts of the "world, the mysteries of salvation are preserved in their "imperishable purity."

About the same time the Eastern Church through Sergius, Metropolitan of Cyprus, addressed itself to the Pope in these words: "O, holy head, Jesus Christ has set up thine Apostolic "Chair, made strong by God as an unchangeable fortress, as a "light and rule of faith . . . thou, as head and teacher of "the right and unadulterated faith, art the destroyer of unholy "heresies." * Theodore consequently condemned those Patriarchs that had been accused before him.

* As considerable importance is attached, in certain quarters, to the opposition of the Greek Church against the Roman claims, it may be well to note here the fact that expressions similar to those of Sergius have passed into the *Liturgy of the Russian Churches*, and remain there to this day. Thus, the prayer appointed for the anniversary of Pope S. Silvester contains these words: "Thou art the head "of the holy assembly; thou dost render illustrious the throne of the Prince of "the Apostles, O divine head of the holy bishops!" Again in the prayer for the Feast of Pope S. Leo I. occur the following words: "What name shall I give to "thee this day? Shall I call thee the wonderful herald and firm stronghold of "truth, the venerable head of the Supreme Council, the successor on the highest "throne of S. Peter, the heir of the unconquerable rock and the successor in his

III. THE EVIDENCE OF TRADITION IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

24. The condemnation of Pope Honorius, however, was not without its effect upon subsequent ages. It gave occasion to the distinction between personal and official infallibility. Already Hadrian II. (A.D. 867-872) had made the remark, with reference to the condemnation of Honorius by a General Council, that heresy is the only instance, when it is lawful for an inferior authority to judge a superior; and he adds (erroneously indeed) that even in this case the Council only condemned the Pope, because the consent of the Apostolic See had previously been given. From this remark it would appear that the doctrine "*prima sedes non judicatur a quopiam*" was not so generally received,[37] as some would have us believe. On the contrary, the opinion that in case of heresy a Pope could be deposed, began later to prevail more widely. Innocent III., S. Boniface, and the Decretum Gratiani admit that the Pope can be judged, if he sins against faith.[38] Innocent III., though defending the indefectibility of faith in the Roman See most decidedly, according to the promise in S. Luke xxii., 32, nevertheless says: "So much is faith necessary to me, that, while in other "sins I have no judge but God, in a sin against faith I may be "judged by the Church." Again: "Only in case of spiritual "adultery can the Church dismiss a Pope, that is, in case of an "error in faith. Still I would not easily believe that God "permits such an error in the Pope, for whom he has prayed "specially in Peter."

The Schoolmen, on the whole, adopted this view and dis-

"kingdom?" In the prayer for the Feast of Pope S. Martin it is said: "Thou "didst adorn the divine throne of Peter, and because thou hast maintained the "Church upon this unshaken rock, thou dost glorify thy name, O glorious "teacher of all orthodox doctrine, O mouth that proclaimed the truth of divine " ommandments, and round which the entire priesthood and orthodox community "gather in order to condemn heresy." Similar addresses occur in the prayers appointed for the Feasts of Gregory II. and Leo. III. These facts throw a curious light upon the early faith, not only of the Russian, but of the Greek Church at large. See W. Wilmers, S.J. *Geschichte der Religion*, vol. p. 123. Tr.

37 See Hefele, iii. 302; i. 144; iv. 768; v. 180; 383, 808, 1002.

38 *Decr. Grat.* Dist. 39, c. 6. Innoc. III., *De Consecr. Pont.* Sermo. 2, 3. Schwane iii. 535.

tinction, as a consequence of the case of Honorius. Isidore already, in a letter whose genuineness, however, is not quite certain, had said that obedience is due to the Pope as Vicar of Christ, provided he commands nothing against the faith. "Whosoever obstinately resists him we declare a heretic and "wholly excommunicated from the society of the faithful. "And this we say not from our own caprice, but we hold it "firmly on the authority of the Holy Ghost." Gerbert, afterwards Sylvester II., speaks in the same sense. The action of Philip Le Bel against Boniface VIII., and of Louis the Bavarian[39] against John XXII., rested on the same assumption,[39] namely, that it is possible for a Pope as a private person to sin against faith. Such also was the opinion of Gerson, Nicholas of Cusa, and Cajetan. Even Turrecremata, the great champion of Papal authority and infallibility, grants the possibility of private sin against faith, because the Pope is a a free agent. Infallibility only appertains to his decisions *de sede sua*. So far he had clearly grasped the distinction drawn by Innocent III. between personal and official infallibility. But then he goes on to explain that a heretical Pope, by the very fact of falling into private heresy, would lose his Apostolic office, and separate himself from the Church, and render himself incapable of a Papal pronouncement.[40] This explanation, however, is more calculated to obscure the distinction than to render it clear.

25. But the *official* infallibility of the Pope was widely recognized in the Middle Ages, and began to be formulated more and more distinctly. Bishop *Aldhelm* of Sherborne in England (died 709) thus speaks of the necessity of communion with Rome: "In vain does he boast of the Catholic faith, who "does not follow the dogma and rule of S. Peter; the founda-"tion of the Church, which is principally (*principaliter*) in "Christ and consequently (*consequenter*) in Peter, and the

39 Hefele vi., 522. Schwane iii., 467, 554.

40 *Summa de Eccl.*, ii. 259. Schwane, iii. 574. See Bellarm. *De Rom. Pontif.*, iv. 8

"fortress of faith, will never be shaken by any storms. . . "To Peter was the privilege over the Church given by Him "who is Truth."[41] *Theodore Studita* (died 826), Abbot of Constantinople, writes to Pope Leo III.: "Save us, O, "supreme Pastor of the whole Church which is under heaven, "we perish. Imitate thy Master, Christ, and hold out your "hand to the Church . . . imitate thy name's sake, Leo "the Great . . . in the name of God let thy voice go "forth, or rather let it thunder, as it is becoming, against this "present heresy." Again to Paschalis he writes: "You are "from the beginning the true, pure, clear source of orthodox "truth." *Ignatius*, Patriarch of Constantinople, writes to Pope Nicholas that Christ has constituted the Pope as the only physician for His body, the Church. For the words spoken to Peter (Matth. xvi., 17) were not addressed to him alone, but to all his successors; and these had ever destroyed all heresies.[42] Pope *Nicholas I.* himself asserts the Papal Supremacy before Greeks and Franks alike. To King Charles the Bald he writes to exhort him not to suffer that the rights of the Apostolic See be impaired in any way, because the privileges of Rome are saving means for the whole Church of Christ, weapons against every attack of iniquity, a sure protection for all priests and all who suffer persecution.[43] The newly-converted Bulgarians being troubled by various heretics applied to him in order to know the sure doctrine of Christian truth. He sent them the celebrated 106 *Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum*; and in the answer he thus speaks: "You ask of "me that I should impart to you the true Christian doctrine, "because there have come into your country diverse Christians "speaking different languages and teaching different doctrines. "We ourselves are not able to do so of ourselves, but our "sufficiency is from God, and S. Peter, who lives in his See, "gives to those who seek the truth of faith. For the holy

41 Ep. i. See Langen, ii. 39. Hefele, iii. 349, 360.

42 Mansi, xvi. 325. See Gelas. *Ep.* xxvi., xxvii. Tournely, Q. 3, a. 2, 1. Langen, ii. 40.

43 *Ep.* xxx. Hefele, iv. 285, 347.

"Roman Church has ever been without spot or wrinkle, "because it was founded by him whose faith was approved by "God." Bishop *Aeneas of Paris* (died 870), who was asked by Hincmar to take up the defence of the West against Photius, argues, in the introduction to his book, that the See of Constantinople has repeatedly been stained by heretical occupants, while by the providence of God the Roman See, which was held by the Chief of the Apostles and hallowed by his blood, had never been stained by heresy. The Lord had said: Thou art Peter, etc. If, then, He committed the whole kingdom to him, how could he not also strengthen his faith?[44] *Leo IX.* makes use of the same argument. "Is it not by this "Chair of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and of the Roman "Church, that is, by Peter and his successors, that all heresies "have been rejected, condemned, and overcome, and the "hearts of all brethren strengthened in the faith of Peter, "which hitherto has never been, nor ever will be lost?"[45] *Peter Damian* calls the Pope the only universal bishop of all the churches. All knowledge is to be sought from Peter, to whom the keys of knowledge and power have been given. He has received from the Creator the chair of truth in an especial manner, so that each one, desiring to be instructed in things divine, might resort to the oracle and doctrine of this teacher. Even Paul, the Apostle, has gone to the magisterium of Peter and has spent many days with him in the divine school.[46]

26.* Langen, after considering these, and many other similar passages from ancient and mediæval writers, nevertheless comes to the conclusion that Papal infallibility was not believed previously to the 13th century.[47] Here is his reason: "According to the ancient view and belief, questions of faith were "never decided by the mere word of a Papal *fiat*, but rather by

44 *Liber contra Object. Graecor.* (Migne, cxxi. 685). Concerning the faith of the Greek and early Russian Church see our note to n. 23 above. Tr.

45 *Ep.* C, 6. 7. 15. 18. Hefele, iv. 768. Langen, ii. 42.

46 *Opusc.* xxxiii. 1; xxxviii. 2.

47 *L. c.* ii. 123.

"Apostolic tradition as spread among the Church, and as "ascertained and established by the competent organs." Plainly Langen has an utterly mistaken notion of Papal infallibility. No one maintains that the Pope can decide by a mere word of command, or that he can dispense with the ordinary means of evidence for tradition. Of course, the Apostolic tradition, and nothing else, is decisive in questions of faith, and, whatever the competent organs may be, they are bound to establish it, in the first instance, by human means of evidence, But the question is precisely as to who is the supreme and final witness to tradition? Can Langen deny that the unanimous voice of antiquity assigns the first place among the witnesses of tradition to the Apostolic See of Rome, or, that it does so on other grounds than the Petrine texts of Scripture? Can he deny, again, that the testimony of the competent organs (bishops) of tradition became decisive and final by the accession of the testimony of the Apostolic See? This, and this alone, forms what we call the substance of the dogma of Papal infallibility, and what we affirm to be as old as the Church herself. Everything else connected with it is the result of that development, which, as we have shown above, is proper to Christian dogma. Langen's objection, therefore, like most other objections against Papal infallibility, is not directed against the Catholic dogma, but against a patent misrepresentation of it—a phantom of his own creation. It is not possible to obtain a true and genuine Catholic notion of Papal infallibility without a thorough grasp of the entire principle of tradition and development.

27* The only truth, then, underlying the statement of Langen is this, that, with the 13th century, the substance of the dogma of Papal infallibility has entered upon a new stage of development. This we grant. For with *S. Thomas* begins a new era of Catholic Theology. It was reserved to his master-mind to bring the entire material of revealed religion into one harmonious system. But it was quite impossible to rear such a

complete edifice of Christian doctrine without setting forth in a new light the whole doctrinal fabric with each and all its parts. Their relative position, their mutual bearing upon one another, their respective functions would necessarily become more clear, and distinct, and definite than before. This would be particularly true of a doctrine so fundamental in the entire system of religion as Papal supremacy and infallibility. Whence the peculiar method of S. Thomas: he is less anxious to prove the dogma of Papal infallibility from Scripture and Tradition, than to view the consequences involved in its institution, and arising from the very nature and purpose of the Church. His purpose is far more speculative than positive; this was quite in keeping with the intellectual character of the age. Still we must not suppose that he created an ideal Church, or evolved it from his inner consciousness; rather he simply took the Church as it presented itself to him in history and in the universal belief of the Christian World, and translated it into the realm of thought and scientific Theology. In his critical knowledge, indeed, he was dependent on the resources of his age which were at time defective, as his quotations from Cyril and Alexandria show. Nevertheless, his main arguments are unassailable. Thus it happened that S. Thomas became henceforth the great authority upon the question of Papal infallibility as well as upon other questions, and his disciples the most determined defenders of that dogma.

Though the term "ex cathedra definition" does not yet occur in S. Thomas, the thing itself is clearly expressed by him. He accurately, though not minutely, explains the subject, object, extent, and limits of Papal infallibility.

The *object* is the traditional doctrine concerning faith and morals. But to faith, that is to say, to revealed truth, a thing may belong in two ways—either directly and principally, or indirectly and secondarily. The latter class comprises those things which if untrue, would impair the truth of that which is directly revealed and is an article of faith.*

* S. Thom: ii. ii. Q. xi. a. a. Q. i, a. 6 ad 1m: Q. ii. a. 5.

The *subject* is the Pope as supreme teacher of all the faithful, and in virtue of his Apostolic authority. The positive ground on which the dogma rests are the Petrine texts of Scripture and the traditional faith and practice of the Church. The speculative reasons lie in the very nature of the Primacy, and of the constitution of the Church, but more especially in the absolute necessity of unity of faith. "To set up a Creed (v. gr. the Athanasian) belongs to the "authority of him, to whose authority it appertains to decide "finally what is of faith in order that all may hold fast to it "with unshaken certainty. But this belongs to the authority "of the Pope, to whom all greater and more difficult questions "have to be referred, as it is said in the Decretals (Extra de "Bapt., cap. *Majores*). For this reason also has the Lord "said to Peter, whom He constituted sovereign Pontiff: I "have prayed for thee, etc. (Luke xxii. 32). The reason "of it being that there must be *one faith* in the whole Church "(1 Cor. i. 10). But this is impossible, unless a question that "has arisen concerning the faith, be decided by him who "presides over the whole Church, so that his sentence may "be held firmly by the entire Church."[48]

Again, in his *summa c. gentiles*, c. 74-76, where he views the whole organism of the Church, and explains the relative position and function of its constituent parts, he thus concludes: "It is manifest that the government (summa potestas "regimimis) of the Christian people belongs to the Episcopal "dignity. But it is equally manifest that, though the people "be divided into many dioceses and towns, yet there must be "one Christian people as there is one Church. Consequently, "as there is one bishop for each particular church, who is the "head of the whole flock belonging to that (particular) church, "so there must be one head of the whole Church, and of all "the Christian people. Again, the unity of the Church

48 ii. ii. Q. i. a. 10; Q. xi. a. 2 ad 3m. *C. Gent*, iv. 76. See also *Opusc*, III. In Symbol. Apost. a. 9.

"requires that all should agree in the same faith. But it "happens that questions arise concerning the faith. Now a "diversity of opinions would divide the Church, unless it were "maintained in unity by the sentence of one. Therefore, in "order to preserve unity, there must be one head of the whole "Church. But it is manifest that in things essential Christ "does not fail His Church, which He has loved, and for which "He has shed His blood. . . . Yet, if anyone were to say "that Christ is the one head and the one pastor of the Church, "who is also the spouse of this one Church, it is not sufficient. "For it is clear that Christ is the (chief) minister of all the "Sacraments—He baptizes, He forgives sins, He is the true "priest . . . and yet, as He is not bodily present among all "the faithful, He has elected ministers who are to dispense "the Sacraments to the faithful. In the same way, therefore, "when He was withdrawing His bodily presence from the "Church, it was necessary that He should commit to someone "in His stead the care of the universal Church. Hence, "before His Ascension He said unto Peter: Feed My sheep "(John xxi. 17); and before His Passion: But thou once "converted, confirm thy brethren (Luke xxii. 32); and to him "alone He promised: To thee will I give the keys of the "kingdom of heaven (Matt. xvi. 19), thus showing that the "power of the keys was to pass on to others for the preserva-"tion of the unity of the Church. . . . Thus is excluded the "presumptuous error of some who try to withdraw from the "obedience and subjection of Peter by not acknowledging his "successor, the Roman Pontiff, as Pastor of the Universal "Church." Again, as to the relation of Papal infallibility to the Universal Church, S. Thomas felt not the least perplexity. "If anyone," he says, "pertinaciously resisted the ruling (of "the Universal Church), he would be considered a heretic. "But the authority (of the Church) resides principally in the "sovereign Pontiff . . . against whose authority neither Jerome, "nor Augustine, nor any of the holy Doctors defended their

"(own) opinions." We have quoted these passages of S. Thomas not only because they are important as determining an epoch in the history of this dogma, but also in order that the reader may judge for himself of the absolute falsehood of the statement in Janus, which runs thus: "It was "on the basis of fabrications invented by a monk of his "own order, including a canon of Chalcedon, giving all "the bishops an unlimited right of appeal to the Pope, and "on the forgeries found in Gratian, that S. Thomas built "up his Papal system, with its two leading principles—that "the Pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and "the absolute ruler of the Church. The spurious Cyril of "Alexandria is his favourite author on this subject (?) and "he constantly quotes him."*

28. The other great mediæval school, the Franciscan represented by the most illustrious teacher, S. Bonaventure, is in perfect agreement with S. Thomas. The Seraphic Doctor especially urges that the decrees of the Pope, in matters of faith and morals, have the same binding force as those of the Church. With S. Anselm he holds that the Roman Church has power to establish a new symbol of faith (Creed), because she has received that plenitude of power from Peter against which nothing in the Church can prevail.[49] *Duns Scotus*, too, is of the same mind, and defends the same doctrine as S. Bonaventure.[50] We need not prolong the list of quotations from the Schoolmen, as it is generally admitted that they believed in Papal infallibility. But it is incumbent upon us to say a few words in order to account for the opposition that gradually arose within the Church itself against the doctrine.

29.* The *reaction* which set in against the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not based on any theological grounds, as, for instance, want of evidence in Scripture or Tradition, nor was it

49 *Apol. Paup.* c. 1. *Expos. Luc.* c. 9, 10. In Sent. i. D. xi. a. 1, q. 1. See Bouix, *De Papa* Prop. 56, and *Traité sur l' Autorité et l' Infaill. des Papes.* chap. xii.

50 *Rep.* 4 *Dist. xix.* q. 1, Schol. 5.

* *The Pope and the Council*, chap. iii. p. 257 (*English Transl.*).

confined to Papal infallibility, but extended likewise to the infallibility of General Councils, and in particular to the Primacy, or the superiority of the Pope over General Councils. The origin and causes of the Anti-papal tendency lay entirely in the circumstances of the times. The sad condition in which the Church found herself in consequence of the Western Schism, forced men to resort to every kind of expedient in order to extricate the Church from an intolerable situation. Such an expedient was the theory of the superiority of a General Council over the Pope. Having once started the new doctrine its authors and advocates were bound to justify it theologically as best they could. Precisely the same may be said of the later Gallican School of opposition. It derived what life and strength it had from influences external to the Church and to theological science. This is clear from the testimony of *Petrus de Marca* who writes thus (A.D. 1682): "The opinion in favour of Papal "infallibility is unanimously taught in Spain and Italy, and all "other Christian countries, so that the opposite opinion, which "is usually attributed to the School of Paris, must be numbered "among the opinions which are merely tolerated. All univer-"sities, with the sole exception of the Old Sorbonne (and even "here he had of late noticed a change) ascribe to the Roman "Pontiffs authority to decide infallibly in matters of faith."[51] The letters, likewise, which the French Clergy, on the subject of Jansenism, addressed to Innocent X. (A.D. 1655), and to Alexander VII. (A.D. 1660), frankly acknowledge the infallibility of the Pope, and thus form a peculiar contrast to the Gallican articles of 1682, so that Benedict XIV. could truly say of Bossuet's *defensio Cleri Gallicani* that it would be difficult to find a work more contrary to the teaching universally received. Indeed, the doctrine of S. Thomas continued to be defended by the great Theologians of the Church, as Turrecremata, Autoninus, Cajetan, Bellarmine, and that Suarez could call it

51 Petr. de Marca, *Observationes supra Theses Claram.* No. xvii. Bellarm, *De Controv.* s. xi.

sententia communissima, and even *veritas catholica*.* Indeed, the opposition from within the Church had gradually lost its strength, and was practically dead by the time of the Vatican Council. The consensus of Catholics was all but unanimous. The opposition within the Council was mainly confined to the opportuneness of a definition. The sharp and vigorous attack upon the truth itself was due to the spirit that came from without the Church. The Church herself felt that all the conditions under which a revealed truth has run its course of development, were now given and the dogma was ripe for definition.

30. We subjoin the full text of the Vatican definition, as it is a brief recapitulation of the whole doctrine we have tried to establish in the present chapter.

"Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also "included in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, "as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses "over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the "perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and Œcumenical "Councils also have declared, especially those in which the "East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. "For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, "following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth "this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to "keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence "of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my "Church,† these things which have been said are approved "by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion "and her holy and well-known doctrine has always been kept "undefiled. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree "separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope

* For a catena of English witnesses to this doctrine both before and after the Reformation see Cardinal Manning's '*The Vatican Council and its Definitions*, p. 140, 152.

† S. Matthew xvi. 18.

"that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the "Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true "Christian religion.* And, with the approval of the Second "Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy "Roman Church enjoys supreme and full Premacy and pre-"eminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly "and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the "plentitude of power from our Lord Himself in the person "of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose "successor the Roman Pontiff is; and as the Apostolic See "is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also "if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be "defined by its judgment.‡ Finally, the Council of Florence "defined:† That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of "Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father "and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed "Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power "of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church.§

"To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made "unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might "be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with "equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and "pure where it had been received. Therefore the bishops of "the whole world, now singly, now assembled in synod, "following the long-established custom of Churches,|| and the "form of the ancient rule,** sent word to this Apostolic See of "those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith,

* From the Formula of St. Hormisdas, subscribed by the Fathers of the Eighth General Council (Fourth of Constantinople), A.D. 869. Labbé's Councils, vol. v. p. 5833, 622.

† From the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council (Second of Lyons), A.D. 1274. Labbé, vol. xiv. p. 512.

‡ From the Acts of the Seventeenth General Council of Florence, A.D. 1438. Labbé, vol. xviii p. 526.

§ John xxi. 15-17.

|| From a letter of S Cyril of Alexandria to Pope S. Celestine I. A.D. 422, vol. vi. part ii. p. 36, Paris edition of 1638.

** From a Rescript of S. Innocent I. to the Council of Milevis, A.D. 402. Labbé, vol. iii. p. 47.

"that there the losses of faith might be most effectually "repaired where the faith cannot fail.* And the Roman "Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circum-"stances, sometimes assembling Œcumenical Councils, or "asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout "the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using "other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to "be held those things which with the help of God they had "recognised as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and "Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised "to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might "make known new doctrine, but that by His assistance they "might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation "or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And "indeed all the venerable Fathers have embraced and the "holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed their "Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy "Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according "to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the "Prince of His disciples: I have prayed for thee that thy faith "fail not, and, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.†

"This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was con-"ferred by Heaven upon Peter and his successors in this "Chair, that they might perform their high office for the "salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ kept away "by them from the poisonous food of error, might be "nourished with the pastures of heavenly doctrine; that the "occasion of schism being removed the whole Church might "be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm "against the gates of hell.

"But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of

* From a Letter of S. Bernard to Pope Innocent II. A.D. 1130. Epist. 191, vol. iv. p. 433, Paris edition of 1742.

† Luke xxii. 32. See also the Acts of the Sixth General Council, A.D. 680. Labbé, vol. ii. p. 659.

"the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are "found who take away from its authority, we judge it "altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative "which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join "with the supreme pastoral office.

"Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received "from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory "of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Relig- "ion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred "Council approving, We teach and define that it is a dogma "divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he "speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when in discharge of the office "of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his "supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regard- "ing faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, "by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, "is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine "Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for "defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that "therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irre- "formable* of themselves, and not from the consent of the "Church.

"But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to con- "tradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

"Given at Rome in Public Session solemnly held in the "Vatican Basilica in the year of Our Lord One thousand "eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of "July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate."

* *i.e.* in the words used by Pope Nicholas I. note 13, and in the Synod of Quedlinburg, A.D. 1085, "it is allowed to none to revise its judgment, and to sit in judgment upon what it has judged." Labbé, vol. xii. p. 679.

CHAPTER XV.

THE CHURCH AND CIVILIZATION.

1. We have often had occasion, in the course of these volumes, to point out that Christianity in general and the Catholic Church in particular have been most influential factors in civilizing the world. It is for the Church historian to trace Christianity in its course and drift, and to guage the impress that its preaching and practice have left on public life and private morals. Still, without trespassing on his province, it may not be out of place here to focus the main principles, at least in so far as they bear on the foregoing chapters. The more modern civilization proves itself ungrateful towards the mother that bore her, the more strenuously should the apologist exert himself to show that no other religion has exercised such mighty civilizing influence as Christianity. Its chief influence lay in the direction of mind and will, that is to say, of intellectual and moral progress, both of which, especially the latter, are most closely bound up with the great social problem. And first we shall consider the social and moral life of the early Christians, which, from the very first, standing in marked contrast to the lives of Jew and Gentile, exercised a deep and lasting influence on the centuries that followed. How applicable are our Lord's words: "By their fruits ye shall "know them!" It is the Christian life that has extorted most admiration from the heathen. "The Greeks," says S. John Chrysostom, "do not judge of the truth of Christianity by its "dogmas, but they measure Christian dogmas by the standard

"of Christian life. Thus women and slaves instruct others by "leading godly lives."[1]

2. The civilizing power of religion in general was recognized by all the ancients. They were fully persuaded that religion was capable of sustaining the entire social fabric of family and State. It was the arbiter of right, the teacher of morals, and the guide of life. The gods ruled all affairs of State. They were the guardians and protectors of the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth proved itself worthy of their protection by the measure in which it did their bidding. Prosperity or adversity hung trembling in the balance of obedience to the laws of the gods. Thus Caecilius in M. Felix singles out the temples and shrines of the gods as being at once the glory and the safeguard of the Roman Empire.[2] Hence, in the teeth of such an overwhelming agreement among the nations, it was reputed a crime against humanity to attempt either to overthrow or to impair a belief in the gods that was so salutary and so beneficial, and that had such a prestige of antiquity in its favour. Among the nations of the East, Church and State were knitted together in still closer bonds. Great empires as well as individual tribes and cities were conscious of being under the wing of the gods whom they most delighted to honour. And this consciousness was the fountain-head whence they drew their martial prowess and patience in enduring hardships.

But nowhere was religion so intimately bound up with the State as among the Israelites. The pivot on which their whole polity and constitution turned was Jahve's Law. They were linked to their God by a sacred covenant which assured them victory over their enemies, and undisturbed possession of the promised land, if only they fulfilled their part in the covenant. In Israel the Theocracy was not an empty name but a living reality: God dwelt in the midst of His people, and enriched them with every blessing.

1 Chrysostom. *Hom. Ephes.* 22.

2 *Octav.* c. 7.

3. But neither the false religions of the heathen nor even the true, but imperfect, religion of Israel were able to regenerate the world. To heal the woes and miseries of mankind a new covenant, a nobler religion, was needed. That religion is Christianity and the Spirit of God. It alone goes to the root of the evil. Embracing all peoples and classes without distinction it brings redemption from error, sin, and death; it sets before all the life to come as their true end; it views this life as a stepping-stone to eternity, and earthly goods as a means for laying up treasures in heaven, and thus overcomes the base charms of sensual enjoyment, and plants in the hearts of men a new and indestructible principle of life, divine charity. (Rom. v. 25). The Incarnation of the Son of God has changed the face of the earth; the very name of its founder, Jesus (Saviour, Redeemer) suggests the deliverance of mankind from the bondage of sin, death, and devil. By His example He has taught us in the most beautiful way how to sanctify our lives. He was meak and humble, and emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. He called none of this world's goods His own, for He had not whereon to lay His head. And yet He healed the sick, fed the hungry, and comforted the sorrowful. He spoke as one having power, and His words struck a chord in the heart of suffering humanity. From sheer love of men He chose to suffer, to be persecuted, and put to a most cruel death. Jew and gentile united to strike Him down. But He who was thus killed, in the simple words of the Apostle, was the Author of Life (Acts iii., 15 1), and the cross became henceforth the tree of life to mankind. All eyes would now be turned to Calvary (John xix. 37), thither all hearts be drawn for ever more (John xii. 32).

4. With justice, then, Jesus could say: My Kingdom is not of this world. So, in like manner, He could require His disciples to be steadfast and patient when the world hated and persecuted them, as it had hated and persecuted Him before them. And as He was offering up Himself in sacrifice in order

to purchase for all life divine and joy everlasting, He could declare the poor, the mourners, and the persecuted to be blessed, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven. To the sick of this world He could impart the lesson they needed, while reminding His poor disciples not to be solicitous for meat and drink and raiment, and still less heaping up treasures which rust and moth consume and which thieves break into and steal. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, "and all these things shall be added unto you." Should they already possess earthly riches, they are to use the mammon of iniquity to gain treasure in heaven by succouring their neighbour in his need for God's sake.

5. The disciples and the faithful generally imitated the example of Jesus, and put in practice His teaching. Deriving superior strength from faith, and fixing their gaze on the world to come, they could afford to disregard the uncertain hazards of life. They evinced their Christian charity by their good deeds in lending a helping hand to the unfortunate, and to those in bodily and spiritual distress. The faithful gloried in tribulation, "knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and "patience trial, and trial hope, and hope confoundeth not" (Rom. v. 3-5). They accounted the sufferings of this life as nothing, as not worthy to be compared with the glory to come, that shall be revealed in us (Rom. viii. 17-18): for that "which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation "worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight "of glory" (2 Cor. iv. 17). With light hearts the Apostles left all and followed Christ, neither had the primitive Christians anything of their own. They had but one heart and one soul; neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. They were mindful of the Lord's words: "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy." And hereby they were imitating their Father in heaven who is merciful. Their reward shall be great in heaven, and they shall be called the sons of the Highest. (Luke vi. 35-36).

When the neglect of widows gave rise to dissatisfaction at Jerusalem, deacons were appointed for the special purpose of ministering to the poor (Acts vi. 1 seq). S. Paul, who maintained himself by the work of his hands, ordered collections to be made in all the Churches he had founded, for the poor in Jerusalem. He also urged the faithful in the several Churches to esteem and support one another. And he rebuked the Corinthians for not keeping the Agape or love-feasts in common. "Everyone taketh before his own supper to eat, "and one indeed is hungry, and another is drunk . . . Do "you put them to shame that have not?" (I. Cor. xi. 21-22). He admonishes the Romans to communicate to the necessities of the saints, pursuing hospitality. (Rom. xii. 13). He bids Timothy: "Charge the rich of this world not to be high-"minded, nor to trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the "living God who giveth us abundantly all things to enjoy: to "do good, to be rich in good works, to give easily, to com-"municate to others: to lay in store for themselves a good "foundation against the time to come that they may lay hold "on the true life." (I Tim. vi. 17-19). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes thus: "Let the charity of the "brotherhood abide in you; and hospitality do not forget, for "by this some, not being aware of it, have entertained angels. "Remember them that are in bonds, as if you were bound "with them, and them that labour, as being yourselves also in "the body." "And do not forget to do good, and to impart, "for by such sacrifices God's favour is obtained." (Heb. xiii. 1-3, 16). St. James, when proving that faith cannot save us without good works, brings forward as an instance the uselessness of fine words to relieve distress, unless accompanied by kind deeds. "He," says S. John, "that hath the sub-"stance of this world, and shall see his brother in need, and "shall put up his bowels from him: how doth the charity of

8 I. Cor. xvi. 1, 2; II. Cor. viii. 14; ix. 9.

"God abide in him? My little children, let us not love in word, nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth." (I John iii. 17-18).

6. The most wretched and abject class of poor were SLAVES, who swarmed not only in the East, but also among Greeks and Romans, and even among the Germans. They were not accounted as men, but as implements, chattels, and beasts, stamped in their nativity to bear the yoke. Their physical and moral wretchedness clamoured to heaven for vengeance. So hard was the condition of the slave that one year of slavery would suffice to thrust him into the rank of a *veterator*, that is to say, to cast him among the heap of worn-out ware. The least offence might entail loss of life or limb. He was subject to the most unnatural outrages. Husbands were torn away from their wives, children from their parents. Where were they to look for comfort in their misery, or for strength to endure their sufferings? Not in the religion of their masters. The hearts of men were closed against them. The asylums and sanctuaries erected in their favour hardly produced a passing mitigation in their hard lot.[4] A master, like Pliny, who treated his slaves humanely, was a phenomenon.[5] Those who treated them with every refinement of cruelty were far more numerous. Slaves were even thrown as food for fishes! Yet Christianity was able to deal with the inveterate canker that had been gnawing at the vitals of the whole social life of those times. It strove to elevate these unhappy beings spiritually and morally, to temper their harsh lot, and gradually to abolish slavery as a blot on Christianity and a disgrace to mankind. Nor was the manner in which Christianity accomplished this great social revolution less admirable. On the one hand the Apostles exhorted slaves, for the love of God, and in the hope of an eternal reward, to bear their hard lot with patience, and to be faithful even to cruel and

4 Möhler, p. 72.
5 *Ep.* iii. 19; viii. 16; ix. 21. Humbolt, *Kosmos* iii. 24.

froward masters; on the other hand, they entreated and enjoined on masters to consider their slaves as brethren in Christ, since all had been redeemed by the same precious blood of Jesus Christ. Only when society had been penetrated with the spirit of Christianity, could slavery as an institution be wholly abolished without danger of a social revolution. But it was owing to the Christian spirit that a great portion of mankind recovered their full human rights and dignity, and domestic life was established on a new basis.

"Let everyone," says S. Paul, "abide in the same calling in which he was called. Wast thou called, being a bond-servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a bondman, is the freeman of the Lord. Likewise, he that is called, being free, is the bondman of Christ. You are bought with a price, be not made the bond-slaves of men. Brethren, let every man wherein he was called, therein abide with God" (1 Cor. vii. 20-24). "For in the Spirit were we all baptised into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink" (1 Cor. xii. 13). "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28; see Col. iii. 11). "Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ . . . with a good will serving, as to the Lord, and not to men, knowing that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free."[6] They have the highest example in Christ, who, although Himself innocent, suffered for sinners. Christian slaves are exhorted to account their masters worthy of all honour, lest the name of the Lord and His doctrine be blasphemed. They that have believing masters, let them not

6 Eph. vi. 5-8. Col. iii. 22. I. Peter ii. 18.

despise them because they are brethren, but serve them the rather, because they are faithful.[7]

Nor is the Apostle more sparing in his admonitions to masters. "And you masters, do the same thing unto them, "forbearing threatenings, knowing that the Lord both of them "and of you is in Heaven, and there is no respect of persons "with Him" (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1). A clear insight into the effect of the Christian spirit on the wretched social condition of the times is afforded us by the touching epistle of S. Paul to Philemon. Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, writes to Philemon, his beloved disciple and fellow-labourer, and after calling to mind his charity and faith in the Lord, intercedes with him on behalf of Onesimus, "whom he had "begotten in bonds." Onesimus was Philemon's runaway slave, whom Paul had converted in Rome. Paul would willingly have kept him with him that he might in the place of his master minister to him in the bonds of the Gospel; but without the master's consent he would do nothing, "that "the good deed might not be as it were of necessity, but "voluntary. For perhaps he therefore departed for a season "from thee, that thou mightest receive him again for ever: not "as a servant, but instead of a servant, a most dear brother, "especially to me. But how much more to thee in the flesh "and in the Lord? If, therefore, thou count me a partner, "receive him as myself. And if he hath wronged thee in "anything, or is in thy debt, put that to my account. I, Paul, "have written it with my own hand: I will repay it; not to "say to thee, that thou owest me thy own self also. Yea, "brother, may I enjoy thee in the Lord. Refresh my bowels "in the Lord. Trusting in thy obedience, I have written to "thee: knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say" (Philemon 14-21).

7. Thus Christianity enunciated the principles by which the gloomy hideous life of the ancient world was to be

7 I Tim. vi. 1, 2 Tit. ii. 9

gradually transformed. In the heathen world sympathy with suffering, and charity to the poor, were unknown. The attempts which it was constrained to make towards alleviating the most frightful misery were utterly inadequate. The few attempts made in Greece and Rome to care for the poor cannot compare, either in comprehensiveness or in motive, with the works of Christian charity. They were essentially for giving State support to citizens incapacitated from work, and for distributing free supplies of corn to the poor. In the reigns of Nerva and Hadrian spasmodic efforts were made to establish schools for the education of foundlings. The *collegia* or brotherhoods were partly supposed to care each for his own poor. No one in the vast Roman empire dreamed of alms-houses or hospitals.

How different was the action of the Christian Church. The care of the sick and poor, from religious motives, for God's sake, was a Christian work in which every Christian community was occupied. Widows and orphans, the poor and the sick, were tended and supported as redeemed in Christ, and made comformable to him in suffering. The heathen, who treated poverty with contempt, and closed their eyes to the wretchedness of their fellow-men, frequently flung in the teeth of Christians the taunt that none but the outcasts and scum of society and credulous women were found to listen to their teaching.[8] Tertullian goes so far as to say that there was hardly a rich man in the house of God. Consequently poverty and distress found a place of refuge in the Christian Church. Besides receiving relief for their bodily wants, the unfortunate pariahs of society learnt how to bear their wrongs patiently, for they felt that they were redeemed, elect, and brethren. How those blunted deadened hearts must have beat with joy when they learnt that even they were the object of that preeminently Christian virtue of brotherly love, and that God the Son had sned His blood even for them! "As for your gibe," says

8 M. Felix, *Octav.* c. 8; 16.

Octavius, "that the majority of us are poor, this is no disgrace, "but an honour. For as the soul is enervated by luxury, so it "is made strong by frugality. But how can the man be poor "who wants for nothing, who covets not his neighbour's goods, "who is rich in God? We had sooner despise earthly goods "than possess them. We prefer innocence; we pray first for patience; we had rather be good than spendthrifts."[9]

8. The self-sacrifice of the unassuming Christians was all the greater on account of their poverty. Tertullian gives a striking description of it. On a certain day of the month, or when he pleases, each one contributes his small offering. There is no obligation, but each one makes his contribution willingly.

Writing from his place of exile, S. Cyprian exhorts priests and deacons not to allow either the poor and needy or the glorious confessors in prison to suffer want. The substance of the clergy is simply the patrimony of the poor, of widows and orphans. And what S. Cyprian preached to others, he practised faithfully himself. He disposed of his own possessions in favour of the poor and oppressed. All the fathers of the Church wrote and acted in like manner. All the Churche's ordinances in regard to the poor are pitched in the same key. Eusebius has preserved in an Easter letter of Dionysius of Alexandria (d. 264) a beautiful passage in which the conduct of the Christians during a plague is contrasted with that of the heathen who left the sick to die unaided and uncared for like dogs. Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa have both delivered discourses on love for the poor. Those of the former are specially interesting to the student of the history of Ecclesiastical Charity. He addressed his audience as "My brethren and fellow poor, for we are indeed all "beggars, and stand in need of God's grace." After describing

9 M. Felix, c. 36. Tat., *Coh.* c. 11. Tert., *Apol.* c. 39

10 *Ep.*, v., 17]; xii., 2; xiv., 2.

11 Euseb., *H.E.* vii. 22,

the several Christian virtues he goes on to say that no worship is so pleasing to God as mercy and charity for the poor.[12] It was a recognized rule that the Church's possessions were destined for the support of the poor. "Let men consider," "says S. Ambrose, "what prisoners the Church has set free, "what food she has given to the poor, and what outcasts she has provided with the necessaries of life."[13] Ambrose's life and work are a testimony to the unselfish devotion of bishops to the works of mercy. His care for the sick and the poor is eloquently described by his biographer Paulinus. Again, we are filled with emotion as we read a letter of Theodoret of Cyprus in which he adjures Pope Leo not to turn a deaf ear to his piteous appeal for protection, nor to despise his grey hairs which many labours had so ill-used. "For," said he, "during my long episcopate, I have never acquired extra "houses, or land, or money, or even six feet of earth for a "grave; but of my own free choice I became poor, having "distributed my paternal inheritance after the death of my "parents."[14]

9 According to the Canons of Hippolytus, the bishop has charge of the poor. The Apostolic Constitutions likewise enjoin on the bishop care for widows and orphans. He is to distribute the offerings of the faithful, and he will have to render to God an account of his stewardship in this matter. On him more than others are incumbent the works of mercy. "You, bishops, "must have care of them (orphans), and see that they are not "wanting in anything; you must be parents to orphans, "husbands to widows; you must assist the adult to marry, "procure work for the artist, and succour the disabled; "you must offer hospitality to the stranger, procure bread for "the hungry, drink for the thirsty, clothes for the naked; you "must visit the sick and relieve the prisoners.[15] The Synod

12 *Ep.* xiv. (xii.), 5.
13 *Ep.* xviii. 16.
14 *Ep.* inter epp. Leonis IIII. 6
15 iv. 2, 3; iii. 3, 4; ii. 4, 25, 27 Hipp., *Can.* 25, 38.

of Orange held in 511 decreed (c. 16): "The bishop shall "provide the sick and poor, who are incapacitated from work, "with food and clothing, as far as it is in his power." A portion of the goods of the Church was to be allotted to widows. When it was a question of relieving the distress of the poor or of ransoming captives not even the sacred vessels of the Church were spared.

In order to give wider scope and application and greater efficiency to the works of mercy, the Christian bishops made early attempts at organisation of charity by establishing hospitals and almshouses, as S. Basil in Cæsarea. Gregory Nazianzen paid a touching tribute to his memory in the funeral discourse. "Go a little way outside the city and "behold a new city, an emporium of piety—a common "storehouse, where, at his command, the rich have gathered up "of their superfluous substance and the poor have given up "their mite . . . where sickness is suffered with patience, "where misfortune is welcomed and mercy put to the test." Those who have read the same saint's powerful description of the lepers in his sermon on the poor will be able to appreciate the winged words in the funeral oration. What are all the splendid works of the ancients, with their egotistical pride and icy-cold hearts, when weighed in the balance with these palaces for the poor? The establishment of houses for the poor and for strangers was mentioned at the Synod of Chalcedon. The Synod of Tours (567) ordered every city to make provision for the poor. Gregory the Great took active measures, both by his personal action and by his decrees, for providing for the poor.[16]

10 That Christian charity had produced a powerful impression on heathen society is attested by Julian the Apostate. In his opinion the Godless religion owed its growth and expansion to three causes: its practical charity, its care for

16 See Kirchenlexicon, 2 Ed. i. 1,360, where the modern literature on the subject is given. Kraus, *Real-Encycl.* ii. 991. Hergenröther, *Kirchengesch.* i. 637, 820.

death, and what he is pleased to call its hypocritical sancti moniousness of life. Wherefore he called upon the heathen to emulate the Christian in feeding the poor and in establishing hospitals. The State furnished the means, but private bounty was also to be enlisted in the cause.[17]

11. The wider Christianity spread and the more it penetrated with its spirit the masses and classes of men, the greater and more flourishing became the work of Christian charity. The rise of monasteries marks a new epoch in this respect. They became the homes of the poor. For not only did a poor man never knock in vain at the monastery door, but the monasteries frequently maintained poor-houses, hospices and schools. In these works, Benedictines, Cistercians and Premonstratensians vied with one another. Moreover, numerous guilds or brotherhoods were established which devoted themselves in an especial manner to ministering to the sick and the poor, *e.g.* the brothers of the Holy Ghost, the brothers of S. Antony, the sisters of S. Elizabeth, the Beguines, the Teutonic order and the knights S. John, the Lazarists, Alexians, Trinitarians, the congregations of Peter Nolascus, Kalendar, the Humiliates, and Jesuates. In modern times it is sufficient to point to S. Vincent of Paul. The orders of sisters of charity founded by him, as well as several kindred orders of mercy, especially the Little Sisters of the Poor, are to this day doing a good work in all countries of the world, and particularly among the English speaking races. The Reformation, on the other hand, destroyed many monasteries, confiscated the goods of the poor, and handed them over to the rich. The poor were deprived of their asylums, and the unselfish exercise of Christian charity and brotherly devotion was rendered impossible. In England, according to Döllinger,[18] the Reformation was the triumph of the rich over the poor, of capital over the rights of labour.

17 *Ep.* xlix. See Schultze, *Geschichte des Untergangs des Griechisch-Römischen Heidenthums.* Jena 1887, p. 164.
18 *Kirche*, p. 20.

12. The Church, though tenderly solicitous for the poor, cannot be accused of encouraging indolence and sloth. On the contrary, as Christianity ennobled and elevated into a duty the labour which Greeks and Romans had despised and handed over to slaves, so the Church strove to relieve the poor by inducingt hem to work. The example of Christ who is called "the carpenter," and "the carpenter's son," was not lost on Christians. (Mark vi. 3). Nor could they forget the example and teaching of S. Paul. He lays it down as a cardinal principle of practical Christianity: "If any man will not work, neither let him eat." (II Thessal. iii. 10). He supported himself, on his missionary journeys, by working as a tent-maker. The first and chief duty he imposes on each one is to set his own household in order, and to care for his own. Only the genuine poor are to receive relief. (I Tim. v. 4; viii. 16). And it is enacted in the Apostolic Constitutions: "If a glutton or a drunkard or an "idler ask for support, he is as undeserving of relief, as he is of "the Church's fellowship." [19] Boys should be provided with sufficient means for learning a trade, lest they be burdensome to their relatives, and impose on their good nature. The fathers often protest against the misdirected benevolence that relieves loafers and vagrants. "Let this be your rule," says S. Ambrose, "to be humane, and at the same time not to rob the truly poor." [20] The objection that Christianity was detrimental to public interests, is not new. As early as Tertullian it was thrown in the face of Christians generally, and he well parries the thrust.[21]

It was the example set by Christians, and the dignity imparted to labour by religion, that went far towards making the poor reconciled with their hard condition. The monks, while converting forests into arable land, learning trades, and spreading civilization, were at the same time teaching youth to

19 ii. 4; iv. 2

20 *De Offic.* ii. 16. Aug., *Ep.* xciii.

21 *Apol.* c. 42.

labour, and affording opportunities for agriculture, and for the practice of trade and art. The *monts de piété*—a kind of savings-bank and pawn-shop—instituted in Italy in the middle ages, were intended to prevent the plunder of the poor, and to secure them a fair wage for their labour. By this equitable adjustment of the balance between labour and capital, and by the status given to labour as a moral and religious duty imposed on man, social distress was in great measure either averted or considerably allayed.

13. Thus the spirit of Christianity set a religious zeal on political economy, and on the whole industrial system. Wealth and profit were looked upon not as an end, but as a means; not as the *summum bonum*, but as God's gift to enable man to attain heaven. The crude utilitarianism of the ancients, and more particularly of the Romans, had, in time of the Cæsars, become a hideous excrescence, sucking the very life-blood out of the people, and draining the nation of prosperity. The one end of the common people seemed to be to pay taxes without limit, to till the soil for the Emperor and his officials, and to minister to the comfort and luxury of the rich nobles. This shameful plundering of the provinces, coupled with public calamities, had raised the distress and discontent of the great mass of the population to the highest pitch. Christianity, though unable to put an end to the prevalent distress all at once, succeeded in making prosperity revive to a certain extent in the empire. Subsequently the cities of Italy rose to great power, wealth, and magnificence, owing to their commerce and the culture of fine arts. The Hanseatic League of German cities enjoyed increasing prosperity. Spain, after a long, wearisome struggle, succeeded in wresting her beautiful country from the Moors. France developed into a powerful kingdom, with almost inexhaustible resources. Of course material progress is not perpetual and infinite. Development itself is subject to the law of youth, manhood, and old age. All nations must go through this

periodic course of development; but it lies in their power either to prolong the course of progress, or to hasten the process of dissolution. Much, and perhaps everything, will depend on their moral and religious condition. The great discoveries of modern times have given an enormous impetus to industry and commerce; but there can hardly be any question that prosperity and contentment have diminished, and that pauperism and distress are on the increase. The progress made in the comforts of life has been more than counterbalanced by the terrible results of modern political economy. The ferocious passion for wealth, and an insane system of competition, have reduced millions of men to the degraded condition of mere machines. It cannot be urged enough that worldliness and materialism are at the root of the evil. A return to the Christian ideal is the only remedy both for employer and employed, for the capitalist and the labourer. It is remarkable, too, that progress is confined to Christian peoples. Neither Asia, nor other countries dominated by the Crescent, have any share in it. America was civilized by the Western Christianity. Australia and Africa are led by the same hand.

14. The Church could not have abolished slavery all at once and in principle without shaking society to its foundations, and inflicting untold misery on the slaves themselves. She was bound to carry out the doctrine laid down by S. Paul. But she cleared the way for its gradual abolition by opening her gates to those wretched beings, and by striving to make them spiritually and morally free. Heedless of the scoffs and gibes of the heathen, Christians confess "that their aim is to train "all men in the word, although Celsus is opposed to their so "doing. Accordingly we teach slaves how to awaken within "themselves nobler sentiments, and thus to be made free "through the word."[23] Thus Christianity succeeded in the work which heathenism had declared to be impossible. Many

[23] Orig., *C. Cels.* iii. 44. See Möhler, ii. 83.

slaves were converted into virtuous Christians, and armed with patience and fortitude proved themselves worthy followers of Christ amid all the dangers and difficulties that encompassed them. Not a few became saints and martyrs. How many, too, of whom the world has not heard suffered martyrdom in the houses of their masters and mistresses!

The Church exhorted Christian masters to treat their slaves as brothers and Christians, and recommended their manumission as a work most pleasing to God.[23] For as slavery sprung from sin (Ham), redemption from sin necessarily entailed the abolition of slavery. The sinner is the only slave; those who are morally born again are free and noble. Hence masters, when converted, gladly gave liberty to their slaves, in order to celebrate the feasts of the Lord with pomp and splendour.[24] Hermes, Prefect of Rome in the reign of Trajan, was converted with his wife and children and 1,250 slaves. On Easter-day, when they were baptized, he gave them their civic freedom, and also the means to enable them to make use of their privilege. It is related by Salvian that slaves were daily receiving the rights of Roman citizens, and that they were free to take with them what they had earned as slaves in the houses of their masters.[25] The Church also encouraged these manumissions by allowing them to take place within the sacred precincts; by practically obliterating the distinction of class or rank, and by opening her offices to all alike, although due regard for the existing order imposed upon her the duty of a certain amount of discretion. In the Eastern empire the Greek monasteries worked particularly hard for the abolition of slavery. To keep slaves, they declared, was unworthy of man. S. Chrysostom delivered discourses to this effect. He wished Christians to be their own servants, even as Christ suffered not

23 Ignat., *Ad Polyc.* c. 4. Chrys., *Homil. S. Lazar.* c. 7; *In Ep. i. ad Cor.* xl. 5. *Ad Ephes.* xxi. Ambros., *De Abrah.* Aug., *De Civ. Dei* xix. 15. Gelas., *Ep.* xiv. 14, 20. See Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i. 157, 173, 781; ii. 63.

24 Gregor. Nyss., *Orat. in Resurr.* iii.

25 *Ad Eccl. Cath.* iii. 7. See Möhler, p. 90, 104.

others to minister to him, or at any rate to keep only such servants as were necessary ; but in no case to keep a number of slaves for show. Later on slaves were to be found in the monasteries and with priests ; but they were gently treated and were set free on very easy terms. In the time of S. Louis most of the episcopal sees in the Frankish empire were filled by manumitted slaves. Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, the first prelate in the kingdom, was a bondman by birth.[26] To the Middle Ages belongs the honour of abolishing slavery proper. By the twelfth century slaves had disappeared from the Christian States of Europe.

15. The ancients would never have effected such a complete transformation of the whole social order. Nay, they never even made the attempt. Rather, as time went on, the slavery actually existing everywhere became more and more inhuman and cruel. Philosophers and statesmen had set to work in sober earnest to build up the whole social fabric, on the distinction made by nature between masters and servants. Only a few stray voices spoke in a different strain. The Christian Emperors—foremost among them Constantine and Justinian—supported the Church in her efforts to ameliorate the condition of the slaves : the latter by punishing all wilful killing of a slave as murder, and by forbidding the Jews to detain Christian slaves ; the former by doing away with the legal restrictions on manumission, by facilitating marriage, and admitting the manumitted to full civil rights. Such cruel punishments as crucifixion and branding on the forehead were forbidden. Slaves, too, were to have the benefit of the Sabbath rest.

16. Islam gave slavery a new lease of life. Many Christians, taken prisoners in war, were carried into slavery by the Mahommedans ; others were sold by Jewish or Christian slave-dealers to heathens or Mahommedans. The Church fought against this evil. She strove to stir up the secular

26 See Article by Kober in *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 443. Hefele, ii. 82, 84, 781, 638, 652, 683 ; iii. 40, 355. Hergenröther, ii. 577, 788.

powers to undertake expeditions to liberate the Christian slaves,[27] and sought to effect their ransom through the instrumentality of her own orders. Unfortunately, with the advent of modern times, the detestable system has once more obtained a footing among Christian peoples. After the discovery of America, negro-slavery spread with frightful rapidity. Las Casas' well-meant advice to spare the weak and sickly Indians, and to employ for hard labour those powerfully built, has had a fatal result. For three hundred years the slave-traffic has depopulated the coast of Western Africa. As Eugenius IV., Pius II., Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., Leo X. had endeavoured to suppress slavery, so Paul III. (1537) took the human rights of the Indians and other heathens under his protection. Urban VIII. (1639), Benedict XIV. (1741), Pius VII., Gregory XVI. (1839), worked for the same end. In the Encyclical "*In plurimis*," dated May 5th, 1888, Leo XIII. described the abolition of slavery in Brazil as the most welcome present he had received on the jubilee of his priesthood. Missionaries—like the Jesuit Peter Claver—have devoted their lives to watching, with fatherly solicitude, over these unhappy beings. Provincial Councils urged upon masters the duty of treating them gently, and in particular secured for those who were married the right of living together. Thus the lot of slaves in the Catholic countries of the South was far better than that of the negroes in Africa. In the English Colonies of the North the lot of the slaves was incomparably harsher. Nevertheless, England has rendered yeoman's service in the Slave Question.

Leo XIII. took the opportunity of urging npon the European Powers to work for the abolition of slavery in such countries as Asia and Egypt. And, indeed, the accounts of the slave-traffic in the Soudan are heart-rending and blood-curdling. Yet Islam, as Möhler well remarks in the concluding portion of

27 Hefele, iv. 588. Pastor, *Geschichter der Päpste* i. 427. Kayser, *Histor. Jahrb.* 1885, p. 208; 1887, p. 609.

his essay on Slavery, has never dreamt to this day of raising a finger against this plague-spot of human civilization.

17. Again, the position of woman and wife in ancient times was often very little better than that of female slaves, and in this respect non-Christian nations resemble Pre-Christian heathens. The Church, however, took the doctrine of Holy Scripture on the equality of woman and the sanctity of family and married life and erected it into a maxim: *Una Lex est de viris et feminis.* Marriage, invested with the sacramental blessing, has rights and duties, which are correlative. The end of marriage became mutual sanctification and the bringing children to heaven—a duty shamefully neglected by Greeks and Romans. Marriage might not be dissolved. Fidelity and chastity were held in high honour. Even second marriage was looked upon as a kind of incontinency. The detestable practice of abortion and the exposure of infants [28] were stringently condemned. The oldest Christian writings contain a prohibition against child-murder, either by procuring abortion or by infanticide. [29] In Germany, too, the Church severely punished immorality. [30] It also inculcated on women their duties as Christian housewives. S. Chrysostom, for example, in words that would raise a blush to the cheeks, denounced the unworthy and cruel behaviour of mistresses to their female slaves. [31] The same Saint has also recorded how high, as a rule, Christian women stood in the estimation of their heathen neighbours, by reason of their continency and chastity. [32] The reverse of the picture is given in Böttiger's *Sabina* and Wiseman's *Fabiola.* The glimpse which they give into the home life of heathen women is by no means pleasant reading.

The effects of this sanctification of family life on social and economic science cannot be appraised too highly. Both public

28 Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, p. 691, 716.

29 *Doctr. Apost.* c. 2. *Barn.* c. 2. *Ep. ad Diogn.* v. 6. Just., *Apol.* i. 27.

30 *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 453.

31 *In Ep. adhe Esp. Hom.* xv. 3.

32 *Christian Apology*, II. chapter vii.

and private life were ennobled. The social intercourse of men and women with one another could not but be governed by a gentler and nobler spirit, as S. Jerome's letters to noble Roman ladies abundantly testify. This accession of dignity to the married state also healed the gaping wounds which lax morals had inflicted in Greece and Rome. Lasciviousness, adultery and slavery are largely responsible for the devastation and depopulation of countries that were once flourishing. In this respect, too, the countries blighted by Islam render conspicuous by contrast the blessings that Christianity has brought in its train.

18. Legislation, too, became tempered with the same gentle spirit. The Church, especially by the Italian Law Schools (Bologna), not only propagated the knowledge of Roman Law in all the countries of Europe, and promoted its study for centuries, but it also infused its own spirit into civil law and legislation. This became more humane both in regard to justice, and to the treatment of prisoners and accused persons. No one will dream of applying to those early ages the standard of our advanced civilization; still it is undeniable that the Christian penal code points distinctly to progress. Not only were prisoners better protected by law, but bishops were charged to visit and watch over the treatment of prisoners, and as far as possible, to release those unjustly imprisoned. Moreover, the Church's right of asylum, and clerical intercession, enabled the persecuted to seek Church protection against unjust penalties, and to expiate their crimes not by the punishment they had deserved, but by a penitential and virtuous life. The attitude of St. Ambrose towards the Emperor Theodosius shews how great was the Church's intercessory power. In like manner the Church strongly set herself against all those cruel and barbarous customs of the time, connected with war and lesser feuds, whether public or private; and by establishing the Truce of God [*Treuga Dei*] secured peace for the unarmed, and at least some breathing time in warfare. In

the struggles between rival parties and chieftains it was the Church alone which upheld God's law and protected the right. Not infrequently the popes were compelled to throw the whole weight of their authority into the scale against injustice and avarice, and to act as arbitrators in the most momentous questions. As exhorted by the Apostles, the bishops undertook at an early time the office of judges and arbitrators. They improved the Roman jurisprudence in many ways; and all through the Middle Ages they exerted a wholesome influence on civil and political controversies. As a result the entire jurisprudence began to be based on higher and milder principles and to be guided by gentler and nobler motives. "Law-books," says Kober, "became in the same measure more humane, as the Church "had a share in framing them; hence it was that those periods "in which the Church was politically in the ascendant, were "always marked by more humane laws." [33] The same may be said of the manner in which law-suits and criminal proceedings were carried out. It was forbidden for both parties to take the oath, and perjurers were threatened with heavy ecclesiastical penalties. Ordeals, though retained, were as far as possible purged of heathenish elements, and gradually abolished. Duelling was forbidden.

19. It is therefore true to say, that "it was the Christian "religion and the Church which, like a mother, nursed Europe "in its childhood, saved it from savagery, and trained it for a "more prosperous career." Nothing but the compact organisation, and consequent power of the Catholic Church, commanding universal respect, could have possibly saved Western Civilization from the havoc of the barbarians. The violent revolution, brought about by the wanderings of the nations, would never have issued into a settled and organized commonwealth without the influence of the Catholic Church. Without the Church, with the Pope at her head, Europe would

33 *Theol. Quart.* l. c. p. 483. Concerning the Canon Law of S. Ambrose and his time, see *Katholik* 1888, i. 337.

most certainly have relapsed into barbarism. Moreover the cause of civil liberty was ever championed by the Popes. They as chief pastors, were also the arbiters among contending peoples, and they set their face equally against the despotism of princes and the wanton rebellion of peoples. They alone swayed that moral power, which could touch the conscience of high and low, when divine and human laws were trailing in the dust.[34] It was the spirit of ecclesiastical liberty that helped the English to *Magna Charta*. The Church's constitution served as a model for the constitution of States. The civil liberties possessed by the English in Catholic times, were mutilated and in a measure destroyed by the Reformation and the spirit of the Protestant State Church, and they were only won back by bloody wars undertaken by the partisans of the sects. In other countries, too, Protestantism strengthened the power of the sovereign, to the detriment and suppression of the liberties of the people. In its later form and in its consequences, it could not help contributing to the restoration of political liberties.[35]

20. Social life has its foundation and its strength in the moral condition of society. The good tree brings forth good fruit, and the evil tree evil fruit. The moral transformation of a corrupt society was the most brilliant testimony to the divine power of the Church and her religion. On the several sides of the new life it imparted we have already dwelt.[36] Belief in one God and Father of all men, and in Jesus Christ whom He sent, planted the love of God and of their neighbour in the hearts of men. Shame for sin, and love of virtue, and uprightness were the products of this faith. Mortification, self-denial, and humility, heretofore unknown virtues, after the example of the Crucified, inspired men and women, old and young, masters and slaves. By renouncing, for God's sake, all the pleasures and comforts of life, and devoting their lives to the service of

34 *Theol. Quart.* l. c. p. 443. Möhler i. 32.
35 Döllinger, *Kirche* p. 153. Janssen, ii. 574; iii. 17.
36 See *Christian Apology*, II. chapter vii.

their neighbours, many saved their fellow-men from being engulfed in the whirlpool of the world, and won them over to the cause of virtue and heaven. *Celibacy* in God's service, in connection with voluntary poverty and brotherly love, have an ennobling effect alike on those who in obedience to a sacred call elect to follow the evangelical counsels, and those who are the object of their prayer and solicitude. *Humility* requires that Christian virtue, like the violet, should bloom mostly in secret; but the odour thereof can never be lost or mistaken. Christian grace is, as it were, a leaven, ever penetrating further and further, until it transforms the whole mass. The process was slow and gradual, but nothing astonished the heathen more than the new virtuous lives led by the despised and persecuted Christians. The miracle that no heathen religion or philosophy could accomplish was worked by simple faith in Jesus Crucified: it rooted up the weeds of passion, planted the seed of virtue, and thus prepared for the great harvest of true civilization.

21. The early Christian Apologists were not slow to avail themselves of these solid proofs for the truth of Christianity. We prefer to let some of them speak for themselves, instead of using arguments of our own. Thus *Tatian*, arguing against the Fatalists, says: "How can I believe that birth is dependent on "fate, when I see how they were made (*i.e.*, the gods) who guide "the reins of fate? I wish neither for power, nor for riches, "nor for office, and licentiousness I abhor. I do not go in "search of gold. I contend not for the laurel crown, and "from ambition I am free. Death I despise, and I am above "all sickness. No sorrow vexes my spirit. If I am a slave, "I bear the yoke; if I am free I do not boast of my high "birth. I see there is one sun to shine on all alike, one death "for all, whether they live in ease or in sorrow." *Tertullian* retorts sharply upon those who were loudest in decrying Christians as useless members of society. Who are they that bring forth this accusation? He answers: "First come the

"procurers and seducers of maidens, and all they that lay "temptations to sin; next, assassins, poisoners and charm- "ers; lastly, soothsayers, fortune-tellers, and astrologers." "Any one," says *M. Felix*, "who compares us with you "will find that we are much better than you, although some "of us may fall short of the standard prescribed for us. "You, for instance, forbid adultery, and commit it; we are "faithful to our wives. You punish criminal deeds; with "us it is sinful even to think of anything criminal. You "dread an accomplice; we fear nothing but our conscience, "without which we cannot live. Lastly, the prisons are "filled from your ranks. There is not one Christian in "them, unless he is there on account of his religion, or is "an apostate." He then goes on to sing the praises of Christian martyrdom. The Christian, he says, may seem miserable, but there is not a miserable Christian to be found. We are all born alike; virtue alone distinguishes us.

22. All things have their lights and shadows; and the apologists have, at times, accentuated the one more than the other. Christianity could not wholly banish sin and passion. Even the Christians of the first centuries had to learn the consequences of original sin. Heresies, too, left their stamp on the morals of the second century, so much so that *S. Cyprian* discerned in them signs that the end of the world was coming.[38] Nor were the forebodings of later Fathers less gloomy. Still *Origen* could say, not without reason, that the wickedest Christians were far better than many heathen—*e.g.* in Athens, Corinth, and Alexandria. The rulers of the Church far surpassed secular rulers. A later Alexandrian Father, *S. Athanasius*, draws a sharp parallel between heathen immorality and Christian morals and civilisation. "Christ daily impels us to fear God, and to practice virtue. He instructs us about immortal life, and makes us yearn for heaven. He unveils the knowledge of the Father, and gives us strength to bear up against death."

38 *De Unit.* c. 16. Orig. *C. Cels.* iii. 30. Athan., *De Incarn.* c. 31; 51.

When persecution ceased, and the State shielded the Church, the ranks of Christians were swelled by many who joined them for worldly rather than religious motives. The Greek and Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries uttered loud and grievous complaints about the large number of bad Christians, who were a scandal to the heathen. The Churches, they say, are indeed crowded; but the theatres not less so. The number of those who tear the body of Christ defies computation. Anyone who did not know how many ears of corn have been gleaned, would suppose that all was chaff.[39] "Who are the Church's enemies? Jews and "heathens? Bad Christians are worse than all . . . The "bad, saith the Lord, live worse in my sacraments than those "who have never approached them. How many, through "you, my brethren, would become Christians, did not the "pernicious morals of Christians repel them?" *S. Ephrem* breaks out into bitter complaints against the immorality of Christians. And one can hardly read Salvian—the Christian Jeremias—without tears. Is it possible that the bride of Christ was really so defiled and dishonoured? Had the Catholic "Romans" in Italy, Gaul, and Africa sunk in a short time so low that the savage barbarian hordes had to be held up to them as models of virtue? Even here we must beware of being biassed and one-sided in our judgments. In these pictures there is undoubtedly a great deal of truth. The masses in the large towns were so eaten up with the corruption of heathen Rome, that they lacked the natural basis of moral reformation. The tribes from the North and East were as yet free from the taint of a corrupt civilisation. They were still the children of nature, simple in habits of life and conduct, though often very cruel.

While the Church was winning over these powerful tribes to Christianity, and improving the wild trunk by grafting thereon Christian grace and truth, she eliminated the remnants of

39 August. *En. in Ps.* xxx. s. ii, n. 3.

enervated Rome, and planted a healthier Christian spirit. The refinement of morals and manner was an arduous task, and of slow progress. Relapses were not wanting, but nothing could impede for long the workings of the Christian spirit. Even the Middle Ages were not altogether a starlight night, but partly a period of stormy spiritual activity (of earnest religious piety and Christian charity. Still the whole of society was upborne on the spirit of Christianity). Piety was forcing its way into the upper and lower strata. In the Holy Roman Empire, despite its many contests, the Ecclesiastical power and the secular arm, though preserving their independence, were marvellously united. In all the relations of life, the spiritual and temporal elements were blended together. The numerous religious orders, besides affording men an opportunity of consecrating their lives to God, were nurseries of science, piety, and culture. By preaching and instruction they left a powerful impress on morals. Anyone who dispassionately views the circumstances of the time, must concede that the spirit of Christianity had to contend with difficulties of immense magnitude, and was not found wanting. Where would mankind have been in those days of strain and stress, without the Church? Who could have bridled the passions of the nobles, and levelled the savage instincts of the masses? Who could have instilled piety and brotherly love and example?

23*. As the moral condition of the world has been continually raised by the action of Christianity, so also has a continuous impulse been given to *intellectual* progress. Nor is this wonderful, since the intellectual effects of a religious system are in the closest connexion possible with the moral. Mind and will are naturally dependent one upon the other. Truth is the necessary basis of morality and virtue. In the language of the schools the will is *appetitus rationalis*, that is to say, it is ever guided in what it desires or avoids, by the light of the intellect. The Church has never lost sight of this psychological fact. It underlies the whole controversy on

grace and justification from Pelagius down to Luther. The order of grace is based upon the order of nature. In defending the order of supernatural truth and grace, the Church not only safeguards, to the fullest extent, the order of nature, but she likewise widens, perfects, and ennobles it. The list of Doctors and Saints to which the Church can point, as well as the great libraries of Europe, are a practical illustration of this truth. So again is that curious phenomenon of history; we mean the affinity that sprang up spontaneously between the men of faith and the highest representatives of human reason, between Plato and the Fathers, Aristotle and the Schoolmen. It was faith that infused life and energy into reason and philosophy. These were of themselves incapable of regenerating and elevating mankind. When the Fathers spoke contemptuously of Philosophy, they had in mind either this practical impotency of Philosophy, or the Philosophy that sets itself in opposition to faith. In both cases they followed the example of the Apostle S. Paul. He, too, had warned the faithful of Christ against "oppositions of knowledge falsely so called" (I Tim. vi. 20), and against that science which "lifts itself up against the science of God" (II Cor. x. 5); and he bore witness to the utter incapability of worldly wisdom to regenerate mankind. "For it is "written: I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the "prudence of the prudent I will reject. Where is the "wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of "this world? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of "this world? For seeing that in the wisdom of God the "world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the "foolishness of our preaching to save them that believe." (I Cor. I. 17 seq.) Faith has done what science and reason could never achieve; and faith comes by the word of authority.

24. At first, indeed, the wise, and the mighty, and the strong, who bowed their heads in submission to this "divine folly" were few; but soon many men of worldly learning turned their backs on heathen wisdom in order to find in

Christianity peace for their troubled spirits. Men like Justin, Tatian, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, and Augustine, left the philosophical schools for the Gospel, in order to find in it a safe anchor amid the foaming billows of error and doubt. Even cultured philosophers regarded the truths of the creation of all things by God, of man's redemption by Christ, and his heavenly destiny, as such sublime doctrines, that they willingly exchanged the "pursuit of wisdom" which held out no prospect of certain results, for the possession of the truth in its completeness. They had been begging long enough at the gates of the philosophical schools, and instead of the bread they asked had received a stone. Should they not rejoice now that Christianity had invited them to the banquet of eternal truth? Should they not be glad to subject their spirit in obedience to the divine spirit?

25. Is it, then, to be wondered at that what the Fathers nurtured in the philosophical schools should pass severe judgments on philosophy, and dwell on its sterility and contradiction? Philosophy, says Lactantius, as its very name will show (*i.e.* love of wisdom), is not the possession of wisdom. Moreover, "it is not in accord with itself, but is "split up into schools which hold various divergent opinions, "without having a firm foundation to rest upon. For every "school is at variance with all others, and seeks to run them "aground; and there is not one that, in the judgment of the "other, is not absurd. Thus, owing to the disunion among "the members, the whole of philosophy is brought to destruc-"tion. Whence, later on, there arose the Academy."[40]

Indeed, the practical results of philosophy were next to none. Nor could it be otherwise, Where the sure foundation of truth and moral force is wanting, no deep or lasting impression can be made on men's lives. Even if the philosophers were acquainted with a few scattered truths, they could

40 *Instit.* iv. 3-6. See Döllinger, *Heidenthum*, p. 739.

not turn them to the advantage either of the people or of the educated; they never became a real, quickening, moral force in the world. Even the Apologists, who, like Justin and Clement, made an exception in favour of some philosophers—*e.g.* Plato and a few Stoics—acknowledged the impotence of all philosophy. Others, however, poured scorn upon philosophy as a teacher of life, and with all the more reason, as the philosophers were the most violent opponents of Christianity.[41] Tertullian calls Platonism the "eternal rallying-point of all heresies." M. Felix[42] gives anything but a flattering sketch of the lives of the philosophers, including Socrates.

Tatian is still more severe in his judgment of Greek philosophy. This acute and cultured philosopher finds the doctrines of Christianity alone true and reasonable, and its adherents the true and genuine philosophers. Ambrose also informs us that day by day the philosophers of his time were being abandoned by their disciples, and returned to their schools to find them empty. "People no longer believe the "philosophers, they believe the fishermen."[43]

26. We are as little disposed to call in question the one-sidedness of such judgments as to hold a brief for heathen philosophy and religion. As the judgments of competent contemporary scholars, they show at any rate that heathen wisdom and religion, and natural science generally, are inadequate to set man's spirit at rest. Faith alone, as taught by unerring authority, can do this. It enables man to take a true view of life (Weltanschauung); it alone can save the world from spiritual and moral shipwreck. But as soon as philosophy had recognized the superiority of faith, it began to join hands with faith and to establish a lasting friendship. It was at once apparent that Greek philosophy contained many truths in germ, and that its concepts and dialetical methods were valuable

41 See *Christian Apology* II. chapter vii. Kleutgen, *Theol. der Vorzeit* iii. 169. Athanas., *C. Gent*: c. 10. *De Incarn.* c. 53.

42 *Octav.* c. 38. See also Cicero. *De Nat. Deor.* i. 34.

43 Ambros., *De Fide* i. 13, 84.

auxiliaries for the science of revealed religion, and for gradually winning over the educated classes to Christianity. Apologists of East and West, of the schools of Antioch and Alexandria, vied with one another in employing Greek philosophy to build up and explain Christian doctrine. S. Augustine's profound speculations not only laid the foundations of theology and the doctrine of grace, but gave a considerable impetus to philosophy, by bringing into prominence the will as well as the intellect, and by making psychology a part of philosophy. The Platonic impress on his writings is unmistakable; but everyone will note with satisfaction how the mind and heart of this shrewd philosopher were saturated with Christian truth, and how skilfully he steered clear of the shoals and quicksands on which the loftiest flights of Plato's spirit were wrecked.

The Middle Ages entered on the inheritance that S. Augustine had bequeathed. But the scholastics did not rest here. The development of science and the interests of apologetics both demanded a close examination of the Aristotelian philosophy. And thus arose the mighty philosophical systems of S. Thomas and Duns Scotus, which served, each in its own way, as a bulwark of the faith, and dominated great schools for centuries. In this way all that was good in the best ancient philasophies was rendered accessible to the West. It was a genuine revival and development of Aristotle, not a mere lifeless repetition of his philosophy shorn of the errors that were at variance with Christian truth. And thus philosophy also under the guidance of the spirit of Christianity, contributed largely to the progress of general culture and science. Here S. Augustine's saying was realized to the full, that the truth of Christianity cannot be silently ignored. Even its adversaries are compelled to reckon with this powerful factor in intellectual life. Without Christian truth true science is no longer possible. The great speculations of Moorish and Jewish philosophers in Spain remained fruitless, because they were directed against the fundamental

truths of Christianity. Avicenna and Averroes were illustrious philosophers, but their systems have no value beyond that of historical curiosities.

27. Christian science has ever been unfolding her banner for fresh victories. However much her fortunes may vary, her conquests are as assured as they are undeniable. However much philosophers, more especially the moderns, may have cast themselves adrift from Christian philosophy, they cannot wholly emancipate themselves from its influence. Even they are indebted for much they have to Christianity. Consciously or unconsciously they have drawn whatever truth is in them from the well-spring of Christianity. The very fact that the condition of modern philosophy grows hopeless in proportion to its abandonment of Christianity is a proof of it. Society is shaken to its very foundations because of the intellectual confusion of the age, the sceptism and infidelity that have passed from the classes to the masses. What wonder, then, that the highest authority in Christendom has uttered the watchword: Go back to S. Thomas!

28. The study of philosophy was likewise favourable to the study of the classics. That the Fathers, especially the Greek Fathers, were well versed in them goes without saying. S. Chrysostom's style is, not without reason, called the Attic style of S. Paul. In the West S. Jerome is a model classic. In the monasteries the ancient masterpieces were carefully preserved, copied, and studied. Had it not been for the monasteries, the the rich literature of the ancients would have been lost in the stormy ages that followed. The Humanists, indeed, revived classical studies, collated manuscripts, and rendered them generally accessible; but who preserved them but that Church which, for centuries, had been almost the exclusive custodian of science? The Popes, even in the days of Humanism, were among the most vigorous promoters of these studies. And the monasteries were as solicitous for education as for science. The Church established upper and lower

schools, universities as well as monastic schools. The most famous libraries, notably the Vatican, owe their origin and maintenance to the Church.[44]

29. Nowadays all scientific studies centre in the natural sciences. The great strides made in theory and practice in modern times are due to them. Our present industrial and commercial system is their creation. And it is often maintained that this triumph of realism is a protest against ideal Christian science, and the religious life inculcated by Christianity. And this contention seems to derive confirmation from the bent of these sciences, which is naturalistic if not materialistic. The history of these natural sciences, from first to last, is represented as a series of skirmishes and conflicts in which science vindicates the right of free enquiry against the Church, and finally emerges from the conflict triumphant. Nevertheless, however much the changes are rung and the theme varied, the contention is untrue in the main, and exaggerated in detail; moreover its ultimate consequence would be the rejection of all religion, and with it the downfall of civilization.

The study of nature is a most conspicuous feature in the writings of the Old and New Testaments. They give voice and accent to the deepest and truest perception of nature, and to the keenest sense of admiration and delight evoked by her beauty and power, whereas the writings of Greeks and Romans, their natural knowledge notwithstanding, betray little or no such tendency. The Fathers of the Church, though shunning the world, manifested the most intense interest in nature. Nature's friends were the monks, who promoted and gave a stimulus to natural knowledge. As Christianity, says Alexander von Humboldt, wherever it became the State religion, conferred a great boon on the lower classes by promoting civil liberties, so

44 Möhler i. p. 568. Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, i. Berlin, 1884. *Allg. Zeitg.* 1887. Kaufmann, *Die Geschichte der deutschen Universitäten.* i. Stuttgart, 1886.

it also took a broader view of nature. "The vision was no "longer confined to the forms of Olympic gods. The "greatness of the Creator (so say the Fathers in their "poetic language) is manifested as much in dead as in living nature, as much in the wild rage of the elements as "in the gentle process of organic development."[45] The Christian idea of proving the goodness and greatness of the Creator from the order and beauty that reign in the universe and in nature, necessarily led to nature being surveyed and described more exactly. Hence in the writings of the Fathers (M. Felix, Gregory of Nyssa, and Basil) descriptions of nature, taken from life, are of frequent occurrence. Basil's descriptions are justly set down as masterpieces in their line.[46] Here we see the first beginnings of descriptive natural science. Assuredly it is not sheer accident that nowhere but on Christian soil has natural science developed into a beneficent factor in human civilization.

30. Nevertheless the Fathers are often severe in their judgments on natural science or, to speak more correctly, on natural philosophy. The attitude then taken up by natural science made their position perfectly intelligible. One said one thing, another another. Anyone with a little eloquence belaboured his opponents, laid low their theories, and set up his own which, in their turn, gave place to others. "While these men," says S. Basil, are wrangling with one another, we may "calmly look on and appeal to Moses."[47] Nevertheless, he was desirous of being better versed in the natural sciences. He wished to make further enquiries as to the size and distance of the sun and moon in order to be able to describe more minutely their forces and the effects they produced. For our admiration, he says, is not diminished, if we know the process and the causes by which wonderful phenomena are brought about. But we must remember that only *certain* results not

45 *Kosmos*. i. 25.

46 *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1876, p. 636 seq. Zöckler, i. 83 seq.

47 *Theol. Quartalschr.* p. 654.

mere conjectures are to be taken into account. Augustine was still more cautious. He seems to have assessed the natural science of his day at too high a figure. The greater the darkness, he says, in which the Almighty Creator has enveloped created things, the less can it be cleared away with simple propositions; the more cautiously, too, we must proceed; the more necessary it is to learn the judgment of experts. "It "often happens that concerning the earth, the heavens, the "elements of this world, their motions and revolutions, distance "and magnitude, eclipse of sun and moon, change of seasons, "the nature of animals and plants, and so forth, one who is "not a Christian, may have certain knowledge based on grounds "of reason and experience firmly held." [48]

31. These principles have, in the main, ever stood their ground in the Church. The Book of Nature and the Book of Revelation were both given to man by the same Almighty Creator. We have only to read them in the right light to be convinced that the one does not contradict the other. On the contrary, nature leads to God; the study of nature is a preparation for the study of revelation. Is it a matter for wonder that both are not always rightly understood by all? If false ideas of nature have at times obscured the knowledge of revelation, or if incorrect explanations of revelation have given rise to false ideas on nature, who is to blame? Are there no backslidings in the history of the natural sciences? Even Lactantius, Augustine, and Pope Zachary were so carried away by dogmatic prejudices as to deny the existence of the Antipodes, but was this scientific heresy totally inexcusable at that time? Lactantius' notion that men in the Antipodes would have to walk on their heads was certainly childish; but had not Lactantius been brought up in heathen schools? Heathen scholars also (Eratosthenes, Strabo, Plutarch) had denied the existence of the Antipodes, or the earth's spherical shape.

48. *De Gen*, ad. lit. I. 18, 20, 57, 39; II. 9, 22.

32. True, Aristotle's works on the natural sciences were condemned in the Middle Ages, and the monks were forbidden to read writings on physics (Tours 1163, Paris 1209). But, on the one hand, the degradation of natural science into charms among the Celtic and Germanic peoples necessitated circumspection. On the other hand—and this is to be specially noted—Aristotelian natural philosophy had crossed Spain and penetrated into France in the guise of Arabian Pantheism. Consequently, until the writings were expurgated and a sure text restored, there was no other course open but to restrict their teaching within the narrowest limits. For, in consequence of the Arabian misreadings of Aristotle, dangerous errors had crept into the Church. "That the prohibition did "not aim at suppressing the study of Aristotle in all parts of "Christendom, or unconditionally, or for all time, is shown by "the widespread growth of Aristotelian studies that was then "taking place in all theological institutions, those of Paris "excepted."[49] When, at a later period, decrees were issued against the study of certain natural sciences, such as astrology, anatomy, chemistry, and medicine, it is not difficult to show that they were aimed at abuses. Astrology was, in great measue, enslaved to superstition; anatomy tended to dishonour the dead body; and chemistry was merging into alchemy. Medicine, however, was a forbidden study only to monks and clerics. Not infrequently, on the other hand, the Popes took natural scientists under their protection (Theodore of Cervia, Roger Bacon, Arnoldus),[50] and distinguished physicians, even Jews, were kept at their court. The prohibition to dissect corpses had a religious motive, recognised in all ancient times. The Church, in her anxiety to spare religious feeling, was in reality consulting the interests of science by keeping it within the bounds of moderation.

49 Zöckler i. 363.
50 *Ib.* p. 343.

33. Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus were monks and philosophers of the first rank. Themselves enthusiasts for nature, they cultivated natural science in the full modern sense. Both insisted on the necessity of the experimental method, and were eminently successful in their attempts. All that could be done with the appliances then to hand they accomplished. For centuries Albert was unsurpassed and unequalled as a botanist and chemist. In the province of physics, Roger Bacon towered equally high above all his contemporaries. He was successful both in his actual discoveries and in his prophetical surmises of the future possibilities of natural science. He invented the magnifying glass. He was acquainted with the main principles of the doctrine of the refraction and reflection of light, with the action of the eye and optic nerve. He knew the working of gunpowder before Berthold Schwarz discovered it. And he at least conjectured the power of steam. Both Albert and Bacon were in consequence suspected of magic. Bacon had to endure a long imprisonment. But it should not be forgotten that magic, which was then rampant in many forms, was a heathen excrescence, against which the Church had from the very first been contending with all her might.

Names of secondary rank, though numerous, we pass over. The body of learned writings from the *Speculum Naturale* of Vincent of Beauvais (1250) to the *Imago Mundi* of Cardinal Peter d'Ailly (1410), and the great *Margarita Philosophica* of Father Reisch (1486), rendered the greatest service in spreading a knowledge of nature, and prepared the way for the discoveries that followed. Columbus confessed himself indebted to the writings of the Cardinal just mentioned for his natural knowledge. Raymond of Sabunde (1439), who constructed a system of natural theology on Bacon's principles, is known to fame. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the friars had explored Tartary, and brought these countries to the knowledge of the West before Marco Polo and other

Venetian merchants had set foot thereon. Von Ruysbroek's (1253) account of his travels deserves, says Peschel, to rank as "the greatest geographical masterpiece of the middle ages." Alexander Von Humboldt bestows on him similar praise.

34. In the period that followed, mathematics and the natural sciences were largely studied, especially in Italy. Nicholas of Cusa, the friend of the mathematicians Peurbach and Regiomontan, bishop of Regensburg, laid the foundation for his explanation of the universe, which is described as the pioneer of the monadological system of Leibnitz and the speculations of Schelling and Baader. In Italy he became acquainted with the ancient Pythagorean view of the world, and by his calculations and observations was convinced of the untenableness of the Ptolemaic system. His activity gave a stimulus to the Reform of the Calendar—an object which Rome never lost sight of.

Christopher Columbus, too, the discoverer of the New World, conceived in Italy the resolution to extend his journeys. On his voyage of discovery, which was conducted on a well-defined plan, he used the map of Toscanelli, the Master of Nicholas of Cusa. Copernicus, Canon of Frauenburg, prosecuted his astronomical studies and observations in Italy (Bologna). His subsequent promotion to Ferrara indicates the threads that joined the principles of his system with the theories of Italian natural philosophy and astronomy (Calagnini). It was cardinals and bishops who urged him to publish the work that was to overturn the world. The work itself was dedicated to Pope Paul III. Italians (Galileo), Germans (Kepler), and Englishmen (Newton) entered into the inheritance, and completed and extended the noble structure, —scholars who shine as brilliantly in the firmament of science as they were models of humble faith.

34. The discoverers of new worlds and seas, like the great astronomers, combined love of nature and science with faith. Columbus and Vasco de Gama were too noble to allow them-

selves to be guided by vain ambition or sordid avarice. Some of Columbus' descriptions of the new world have come down to us, and they certainly can compare with the best of their kind. His views on physical geography, his observations on the deflection of the magnetic needle, on inflection of the isothermal lines between the West Coast of the Old world and the East Coast of the New, on the position of the great Sargasso Sea, and so forth, betray a wonderful power of observation in a sea-faring man who lacked a learned education. In the wake of discoverers and conquerors numerous missionaries followed who not only furthered the spread of religion, but also enriched the natural sciences, especially ethnology and linguistics (Las Casas, Roman, Blas de Juana, José d'Acosta). The Jesuits have published most important works on Africa, China, and Thibet, (Paez, Alvarez, Ricci, Schall, Borri, Alexander de Rhodes, Kircher, Rodriguez, Nobili, Roth and others).[51] It speaks well for the high state of the civilisation of the time that men grasped the bearing of the new discoveries, and strove to profit by them. "The ablest among them (the "companions of Columbus) perceived the influence that the "events of the last years of the 15th century were destined to "exert on mankind." Peter Martyr of Anghiera was enraptured with the wonders of the new world; Leo X. stayed up late into the night to read aloud to his sister and to the Cardinals Peter's *Oceanica*. "I would never again," the writer says, leave Spain. "For here I stand at the fountain head of the news that "comes from the newly-discovered lands, and having so much "greater conveniences for writing history I might hope to "win some glory for my name in the next world." [52]

35. And all these great events were taking place at a time when philosophy and the study of nature were quite laid aside in Germany. For, the partisans of Luther and the Reformation had set their face against natural science as well as against

51. Zöckler p. 555 deg. Humboldt, *Kosmos* II. 283.
52. *Kosmos* ii., 299 sag. 316 seq.

superstition, against the astronomy of Copernicus as much as against astrology. "The powerful personality of the Reformer "so inoculated subsequent Lutheran theology with its own "peculiar way of looking at nature that for well nigh two "hundred years it took up no position in regard to the burning "questions of the day."[53] Does not this sound like a confirmation of Möhler's words: "As long as the Protestant "Church believed the doctrine of Luther and Calvin, it had "neither poetry, nor history, nor philosophy. . . As long "as the Protestant Church was Lutheran it was without "philosophy, and when it received a philosophy it ceased to be "Lutheran Does then its faith put philosophy to flight? and "does its philosophy banish faith?"

36. We have already discussed the conflicts that arose on the advent of Copernicanism. We likewise noted that Copernicus' system was impugned by such scientific men as Tycho Brahe and Bacon of Verulam. This is a phenomenon that repeats itself in science whenever a new discovery is made. At the end of last century the great scientific authorities in France and the neighbouring countries denied the cosmic origin of meteorites. For this reason we should be more lenient in judging the Church's opposition to the new system. Anyhow no one was a martyr to this opposition. Giordano Bruno's advocacy of Copernicanism had least to do with his death (1600). "Rather," remarks the Protestant Zöckler, "he gave the lie to the sound ideas of de Cusa by "tacking on them a heathenish pantheism which contained not "a few elements that were free-thinking, and fraught with "frivolous antagonism to the Church. His *spaccio della bestia* "*trionfante* in particular was so pointedly anti-ecclesiastical in "character, by reason of the Satanic ridicule it heaped on "positive dogmas like the divinity of Christ, and of its grossly "insulting language (*e.g.*, in comparing the God-man with a

53 Zöckler, p. 591. Möhler i., 260.

"Centaur) that he cannot be acquitted of blasphemy."[84] And as he exploited the doctrine of the plurality of worlds in order to destroy the doctrine of redemption, and as his life was in keeping with his teaching, he has lost all title to be ranked as a "martyr of science." What Galileo had to endure from the Inquisition, and Kepler from the Protestant fanaticism rampant among the Tübingen theologians, must be judged according to the circumstances of the age. The consequences were by no means so disastrous for science as they are often painted. Scholars (*e.g.*, Descartes, Gassendi, Hobbes) were admonished to be more cautious, but enquiry proceeded, though at a somewhat slower and surer pace, along the path they had marked out. The ultimate consequences were drawn by the believer Newton.

37. The conflicts between science and faith in other departments of natural science have been of slighter moment. Very frequently distinguished professors of science have taken the side of faith. In some instances, as in the province of physics and chemistry (Porta, *Accademia del Cimento*, Redi, Borelli, Oliva) prohibitions and censures were issued which affected more than abuses; but they had very little cramping effect on science itself. From then till now it will be seen that theology has given natural science a push forward, while its own professors were blocking progress. "They have "nothing wherewith to reproach one another. The number "of unreasonable theologians antagonistic to science is fairly "balanced by the number and weight of the men of science "who in their way were equally unreasonable and antagonistic to "science. On both sides their is the tyranny of old-established "opinions, and consequently unintentional obscurantism; both "sides, with a suppositious cock-suredness, furthering their own "views, but in reality obstructing and obscuring scientific

84 p. 533. See Berti, *Vita di Giordano Bruno*. Torino, 1868. Previti, *Giordano e suoi tempi*, Prato 1887. *Revue des quest. hist.* Juill. 1887. *Controverse* Avril 1888. Sigwart. *Die Lebensgeschichte Giordano Bruno's*. Tübingen 1885.

"truth."[55] Nor should it be forgotten that theologians represented higher interests, and that they were not infrequently driven into opposition by the hostile attitude assumed by scientists against Christianity. This is especially true of the natural science of to-day, which, not content with ignoring Christian truth, seeks to work on the masses by treating it with scorn and indulging in sarcastic abuse.

Nevertheless, despite all provocation, the Church is in no way hostile to science. We live in an age of specialists, and the division of labour into special groups has rendered extensive all-round co-operation with theologians impossible; still many theologians and believers, both Catholic and Protestant, have rendered signal service in the departments of science. The astronomers Vico and Secchi, Wurm and Dawes, the biologist Mivart, the anthropologist Quatrefages, Wigan the botanist, are names of repute in learned circles. The French Abbés Hany, Moigno, Rendu, have rendered great service in mineralogy and physics. Catholic and Protestant missionaries vie with one another in geography, ethnography, and philosophy.

38. One department connected with science still remains. *Art* is an important factor in the march of civilisation. It is at the same time the standard for measuring the moral and religious state of a people. In the art of the Hindus, Chaldeans, Babylonians, Egyptians, Syrians, Greeks, and Romans we see, as in a mirror, the point of view from which they regarded the world. Greek art was nearest to Christianity in point of time. Mythology had provided Greek sculptors and architects with noble forms; but their productions, like their religion, were naturalistic and sensual. This two-fold flaw necessarily put a preacher of the Gospel, acquainted with the prohibitions in the Old Testament, on his guard against Greek art. S. Paul, as we learn from his Epistles, shuddered at the sight of idols. For the fact that the

55 Zekler ii. 9.

heathen worshipped the works of their hands appeared to a soul imbued with faith so monstrous, that the artistic beauty of the work seemed to him merely to accentuate its danger to faith. For the same reason the Fathers uttered similar condemnations. Only when heathenism lay at the feet of Christianity did art, which had been pursuing a very humble course in the Catacombs, begin to devote its fuller services to Christianity. The veneration of saints, and the growth of the liturgy, contributed more than anything else to the development of art. The iconoclasm of the Byzantine Cæsars could only impede its development for a time. The Middle Ages were marvellously rich in architecture, sculpture, and painting. Gothic Cathedrals piercing the skies; masterpieces of sculpture, which are the charm of our art galleries; the noble paintings of the Italian, German, Flemish, and Spanish schools, which even now are the admiration of all beholders,—all these prove that art was consecrated by being under the Church's shadow, and that the religious feeling that pervaded those flourishing epochs was favourable to the development of high art.

39. Thus the Catholic Church, by blending faith with science and art, has in a wonderful manner restored the harmony between the soul's powers and between all classes of men. "For in her, as in a true community, all consciousness "of the worth and dignity of individuals depends on the bloom "and beauty, on the inner life, majesty, and nobility of the "whole. In the Church, therefore, individuals are able to "develop an astonishing wealth of ideas. The arts and "sciences flourish, and the most magnificent manifestations of "life and work step forth from their own inner shrine into the "light of day.[56] In such times Augustine, Chrysostom, Thomas

[56] Möhler, p. 260. *Theol. Quartalschr* 1846, p. 405, seq. See also on the whole subject Ratzinger, *Die Volkswirthschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen, Ethisch-sociale Studien über Cultur und Civilisation.* Freidburg 1881. *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armen Pflege.* 2 ed. Freiburg 1884. For the history and reform of almonry see Ehrle, *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Historisches Jahrbuch* 1888. Weiss, *Apologie des Christenthums* I. Freiburg 1888.

"Aquinas, Erwin von Steinbach, Dante, Michael Angelo, "Raphael, Bossuet, Fenelon, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Descartes, "Malebranche, Racine, and a brilliant host of heroes in every "path of excellence were produced."

40. The abuse which modern historians of civilisation have heaped upon the Church, as if she were opposed to social and scientific progress, induced the Vatican Council to declare itself in the chapter on Faith and Reason. It teaches: "Not "only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, "but they are of mutual aid one to the other; for right reason "demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its "light, cultivates the science of things divine; while faith frees "and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold "knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing "the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many "many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither "ignores nor despises the benefits to human life which result "from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came "from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, "they lead to God by the help of His Grace. Nor does the "Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere "should make use of its own principles and its own method; "but while recognising this just liberty, it stands watchfully on "guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine "teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and "disturb the domain of faith."* Christianity, then, and the Church have no reason to fear the history of civilization. Other peoples, like the Chinese, had made the discoveries (printing, gunpowder, magnet) previously, without utilizing them scientifically, or puting them out to commercial profit. Christianity is the only religion which, while pointing out the road to heaven, has likewise transformed and improved the conditions of earthly life. Even now Christian peoples are at the summit of the ladder of civilisation. And if they have in many ways

* See Card. Manning's translation.

emancipated themselves from the influence of Christianity, yet they have not been able wholly to lay aside that Christian character which has been so beneficial to them. Neither race, nor country, nor climate, nor history can supply an adequate explanation of this wonderful phenomenon. It is Jesus Christ, the central figure in the world's history, who has renewed the face of the earth. He is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. And He endures in His Church to the end of the world.

THE END.

APPENDIX I.†

THE ANGLICAN VIEW OF THE POPE'S PRIMACY.

The following is the text (without the notes) of a portion of a Paper read by Professor Bright, in 1875, before the Oxford Branch of the E. C. U., and published under the title: "*The Roman Claims Tested by Antiquity*." The English reader of the Apology will thus be in a position to compare the Anglican line of argument with the Catholic method as represented by our Author.

"Now, recalling the substance of the Vatican dogma, and "taking, as part of it, as in all reason we must, or, at least, "recognising as a basis of it, the assertion that this is in "accordance with the continuous belief of the Church Catholic "from early ages, we may, I think, appreciate the contrast "between such propositions and the evidence of what the "ancient Church believed, as to the general scheme of Church "government and Church teaching, and the position of the "Roman See.

"To that See, and its Church, Ancient Christianity un- "doubtedly assigned a place both lofty and distinctive. A "'Primacy" is not an unfair phrase to describe what is "intended, if by Primacy you understand a precedency, an "eminence, and (in a sense not formal or technical) a leader- "ship. We remember how Athens, in Greek history, began

"with a more definite ἡγεμονία, and was accused of turning "it into a dominion or ἀρχή. Various causes went to make "up the 'primacy' of the Roman Bishops. Their Church "was the only Church in the West which was founded, or, "strictly speaking, organised, by Apostolic hands (here I "exclude Greece from the West, and Macedonia and Thrace "also). Around the Roman Church was gathered the majesty "of the names of Peter and Paul. Again, it was the Church "of the Imperial capital; and, very naturally, the Churches "of great cities became great Churches. It was famous for "its bountiful generosity; it was trusted for its traditional "immunity from heretical speculations (although, by one "account, that immunity was not quite absolute). Thus the "Roman Church was a typical Church, a leading Church in "fact, the first Church in rank and influence. This sort of "'primacy,' involving a moral guarantee of its soundness of "belief, may be that '*principalitas*' which led S. Irenæus to "say that 'every Church' that was itself true to Apostolic "tradition 'must needs agree with it;' so that it was a sample "Church, a miniature of the whole body, and by referring to it "one could see what was held by all. Yet this same Irenæus "could join in 'sharp remonstrances' to the Roman Bishop "when he broke off communion with some Asiatic Churches "on a question of ritual. Again, Cyprian recognised in Peter "the representative of the Apostles' unity, and in Peter's "Roman See an analogous function towards all Bishoprics; "he calls that Church 'the principal (perhaps the original) "Church, whence arose the unity of the priesthood,' because "he regards its Bishop as specially representing Peter, to "whom were spoken Christ's first words on Church authority. "But while he thus spoke, and while he viewed the Roman "Bishop as pre-eminently bound to enforce the rule of Church "order, he evidently regarded him as only *primus inter pares*, "resisted him when he thought him in error, and significantly "observed—'No one of us sets himself up as Bishop of

Bishops.' The appeal or application to a Bishop of Rome on the part of some Africans who doubted the orthodoxy of the Bishop of Alexandria, is quite intelligible on these prin-"ciples, and proves nothing for the Papal claim. But the "Nicene Council is the best instance one could take—the "best on all grounds. If Pius IX. is right, the Church has "*always* known the Bishop of Rome to be its supreme ruler "and its infallible teacher. When was there a fitter occasion "for the exercise of these great functions than at the rise of "the Arian controversy? Yet neither, in fact, was exercised. "Now, on the principle of the Vatican dogmas, why did not "Pope Sylvester close the question by an *ex cathedrâ* judg-"ment? Nobody thought (it is evident) of asking him to do "so. He never attempted to do it himself. Why not? If "the 'perpetual practice of the Church' was what Pius IX. "asserts, this is quite inexplicable; the negligence, on the "part alike of the Church and the Pope, was simply treasonable. "And even when the Nicene Council, which doubtless included "Sylvester's deputies, who held a high, if not the very highest, "place in it, had settled the doctrinal question, it alluded in "one of its canons to the patriarchial jurisdiction—as we may "call it—of the Roman Bishop, in illustration of similar juris-"diction belonging to the Alexandrian Bishop; and utterly "ignored, or rather was manifestly unconscious of, any right "in the Roman Bishop to an exceptional and œcumenical "supremacy. This may suffice for the great Nicene Council. "In after times the legend of a solemn Papal confirmation of "its decrees by Sylvester was invented without any warrant, "and may be ranked with the fable of the Donation of "Constantine.

"The Roman Church throughout the Arian struggle was "orthodox; for we cannot reckon the lapse of Liberius, when "in exile, as properly compromising his *Church*, although, "inasmuch as he acted as Roman Bishop, he could not but "compromise his See. His predecessor, Bishop Julius—

"whose action, by the way, in one part of the struggle was "exaggerated by later historians—was invested with a sort of "appellate jurisdiction—in fact, a right to order a re-hearing, "by the great Western Council of Sardica, which thought fit "to grant this power to the head Bishop of the West, in "honour of S. Peter, but did not recognise it as inherent in "his See. But their canon, inoperative in the East, was not "received by all in the West; for when, in the fifth century, "one Bishop of Rome after another referred to this Sardican "canon as if it were Nicene, the African Bishops exposed the "error by procuring authentic copies of the Nicene canons, "and gave Pope Celestine a strong hint to eschew the 'smoky "pride' of secular domination, and more than a hint to "forbear interference with Church causes in Africa. That is, "they utterly declined to look on him as the universal and "final judge, even in Western affairs. But there was at Rome "a growing tendency to stretch the 'Primacy' into something "like a general overseership; and for this purpose a tradition "of unscrupulous assertion had been forming itself, as when "Innocent assumed all Gallican and Spanish Churches to be "of Roman foundation, and Leo, as Bingham drily remarks, "allowed himself to call anything 'apostolical' which could "be traced to his predecessors. Leo, in fact, procured a "decree from the Western Emperor which established his "supremacy in the Western Church; and in the great doc-"trinal controversy of his time he took part with a yet higher "hand than did Celestine in that which preceded it. He "repeated the unwarrantable citation of a Sardican canon as "Nicene: he treated the most eminent Bishop in Gaul with "despotic harshness: he advanced the interest of Rome, as "well as of the Catholic truth, by presiding at the Council of "Chalcedon through his delegates; but although the Council "paid him all observance as its president, and employed "some language which might countenance his claim of "œcumenic superintendence, it re-heard a case which he

"personally had decided; it judged and approved, as by "superior authority, his great doctrinal letter, and set aside "his delegates' corrupt version of a Nicene canon; not to say "that it passed a canon of its own which could not but be "offensive to him, although it was coupled with respectful "requests for his sanction to give it validity. On the whole, "this Council shows what the Eastern Church thought, in the "fifth century, of the Roman Bishop: it gave him signal "honours as a sort of Primate of Christendom, but it did "not dream of recognising him as an ecclesiastical monarch, "the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It had its theory "of general Church polity, which covered all the ground of "the case—a theory of patriarchal federation, in which Rome "stood first of the great Bishoprics, and, at any rate in 451, "Constantinople second, then Alexandria, then Antioch, "Rome having some not very definite rights peculiar to "herself, but being essentially the first patriarchate, and not "the single all-ruling Papacy. This gives the answer to a "question sometimes put to us:—'Why do not you Anglicans "think and speak of Rome as did all Churchmen in the "period which you profess to admire?' Because Rome is "not what she was in the age of the great Fathers. She "insists on being taken for very much more than of right she "is, and therefore we are obliged to withhold what in ancient "times was deemed her due. It is idle to bid us acknowledge "her Bishop as first Patriarch, when he will not be acknow-"ledged as anything short of a Supreme Pontiff. The old "canonical or ecclesiastical precedency is suspended by the "later and uncanonical usurpation. This point is well urged "in a treatise 'On the Unity of the Church,' written in his "Anglican days, by 'Henry Edward Manning.'

"One need not go much lower down the stream of history. "Various complications in the East, caused by the Mono-"physite controversy, gave Rome a not unfair advantage over "Constantinople; and, ultimately, after various instances of

"what we call 'domineering' on the part of Pope Felix II. "and Pope Gelasius, who seem to have been almost reckless "in their assertions, a Pope in 519 dictated terms successfully "to the Church of Constantinople. In less than forty years, "however, the Fifth Council met at Constantinople, and a "Pope, coming into collision with it, was exceptionally humil- "iated; and when, in 680, the Sixth Council met, we all "know it pronounced a deceased Pope, Honorius, to be a "heretic worthy of anathema. Dr. Newman admits that 'this "is a strong *primâ facie* argument against the Pope's doctrinal "infallibility.' He meets it by saying that Honorius, in his "two letters in question, was not meaning to speak *ex cathedrâ* "as the teacher of the Universal Church: therefore he was not "speaking infallibly. 'Who,' he asks, 'will dream of saying "that Honorius in the seventh century did actually intend to "exert that infallible teaching voice which has been dog- "matically recognised in the nineteenth?' Surely a surprising "question. Pius IX. tells us that the Popedom has all along "had this power. Therefore Honorius had it, and must have "known of it. Why did he *not* mean to use it? The form "of the question really implies that Pius IX. was not 'adhering "to primitive tradition' when he taught that Roman Pontiffs "hold this office of infallible teachers. The fact is, of course, "that Honorius did not look upon himself as Pius looks upon "himself and all his predecessors. But he was consulted as "Roman patriarch, and he meant to speak with all the weight "of that position. Dr. Newman intimates an opinion that in "his letters he was only feeling his way: that they are "'portions of a discussion with a view to some final decision.' "Respect for this great writer prevents me from saying more "than that the letters point to quite another conclusion. 'We "ought,' writes Honorius, 'to say this, not that.' 'You will "affirm this with us.' He makes his statement 'as to what "touches the Church's doctrine, and what we are bound to "hold and teach.' He had written to three patriarchs on this

"question. Then he mistook the bearings of the case—that "he had no heretical meaning—is very possible. But the fact "remains that he wrote officially as Roman Bishop, and that "his name was posthumously branded with heresy by an "Œcumenical Council, whose judgment was accepted by two "other Councils and a long succession of Popes, although the "fact was suppressed in the Roman Breviary when revised in "the seventeenth century—suppressed, of course, for the sake "of 'edification.'

"But, it will be said, Dr. Newman urges that 'the Pope "has no rival in his claims upon us:' that he alone represents "spiritual authority, and 'if we give him up, to whom shall "we go?' and again, 'that he is heir, by default, to the "Nicene Hierarchy,' insomuch that now 'to believe in a "Church is to believe in the Pope.' In regard to the first "of these positions, the context illustrates a remark of Bishop "Wilberforce's that Dr. Newman's 'intense individuality' has "repeatedly coloured his view of historic facts to the extent "of seriously misrepresenting them. His mind has always "demanded a Pope. In his famous 'Essay on Development' "he shows that 'an infallible Chair' was a great attraction "in drawing him towards Rome. So now he asks, Whom "can one obey as a spiritual ruler, except the Pope? 'Can "I put my soul into the hands of the Archbishop of Canter- "bury or of the Bishop of Lincoln? We answer, 'No one "wishes you to do so. *We* put our souls into the hands of no "individual prelate.' At p. 72 he describes religion as 'a "spiritual loyalty to persons.' If he means to any persons on "earth, we cannnot acquiesce in such a definition of that vast "and awful combination of spiritual beliefs, obligations, "actions, which we call Religion. In fact, we hold that an "overstraining of clerical authority has injured the propor- "tions of Latin faith, and created a tradition of Protestant anti-sacerdotalism. . . . The Papacy, in short, is a perversion, by excess and exaggeration, of the ancient polity

"of the Catholic Church. We see in it, not the Divine "development of a principle originally acknowledged, but a "process of human usurpation, the conversion of a legitimate "precedency, or leadership, into a sovereignty swelling out, "age after age, in huger bulk, until its present holder has "practically said, 'The Church—that is I.' That this process "has been in many ways overruled for high and beneficent "ends, is but to say that the Eternal Goodness, here as "elsewhere, has brought good out of evil. It does not prove "that the thing itself was of Divine institution. We have "been looking at the Roman question in this one aspect; "but we dare not permit ourselves to forget other instances "in which Rome has corrupted the deposit of Christian "truth. She is, after all, a great institution, rich in lofty and "splendid types of excellence, marvellously fertile in self-"adaptation, abundant in forms of intense religious energy; "but she is not to be trusted with our consciences—with our "souls. While she is what she is, we *must* hold aloof from "her: we *must* deny her claims: we *must* lay mainly at her "door the miserable divisions of that Christendom whose "ancient unity was so mighty a witness for Christ."

APPENDIX II.†

THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

There is abundant evidence that in England at the present time there exists a very widespread desire for Religious Unity. Whence that desire springs it is not quite easy to say. It may indeed, as all must hope, spring from love of God, zeal for religion, longing for positive truth; or again it may be born only of the *Zeitgeist*. It may thus quite possibly be due to motives merely political, or national, or humanitarian. It is a common place that the English-speaking race now peoples several continents. One in language, it is declared one also in instinct, habit, genius, and character. At the same time in religion it is more miserably divided than ever nation was before. Now, as religion is so vital an element in life and society, this disunion must inevitably undermine the influence as much as it dims the glory of the Anglo-Saxon race. Hence, perhaps, the longing for agreement, for concord—in a word, for unity. But whatever its origin, whether the fruit of grace or only of nature, undoubtedly the

desire exists, and that not as any mere sterile wish, but active, earnest, energetic. No sign of the time can be more hopeful. Strenuous efforts are openly made with the definite aim of bringing to pass a Re-union of the Churches. A Magazine with the ambitious title "The Review of the Churches" appears monthly, under the direction of representative Editors. Again, Annual Meetings are arranged for friendly discussion and intercourse; and one Association has been organised for the purpose of soliciting the prayers of its members for the Re-union of Christendom. True, we cannot say that all those who have this object at heart are agreed as to the precise end in view, or the means they should adopt for its attainment. There are, as the extracts below will show, two distinct currents in the movement.

The Catholic Apologist cannot be wholly indifferent to such a movement. Rather he will watch it with the keenest interest and the liveliest sympathy. Whatever he may think of the means adopted, or their probable result, he cannot but rejoice that a principle so eminently his own, namely, that Catholic Unity is a Divine ideal and an unspeakable blessing to the human race, begins to find, at last, a wider recognition. The following extracts will illustrate the aim and means of the two schools mentioned, while the admirable letter of Cardinal Manning marks and explains the attitude of Catholics towards them.

I. The Review of the Churches to its Readers:

"The tendency of religion in our day is towards union.
"The controversies to which most of our Churches owe their
"rise have lost much of their interest for us: some of them are
"hardly intelligible. The great landmarks of Christianity—
"God and His love, Christ and His salvation, mankind and
"their brotherhood, remain, and will remain. They are words
"of life. But the excitement about exact definitions in
"theology, and correct precedents in Church government has
"largely passed away. The mediæval Church tried to build up
"a tower of dogma whose top should reach to heaven, and one
"result was a confusion of tongues. Now we are trying to
"recover the universal language. Creeds divide: life draws
"together; and we are seeking in the slender and grander
"thoughts of religion the nourishment of a warmer common
"life. The way is open to large measures of unification.
" . Complete union may be impossible, even in the
" long run. Some of the chasms in our thought are very deep.
"But without actual fusion of sects there may be federation;
"and even without federation there may be common action.
"Of the leading Churches of Britain, the Presbyterians,
"Baptists, Congregationalists, and Methodists, and large
"sections of the Church of England, differ only in minor
"points, and if they chose, could easily work together. And
"no one can doubt that if they worked together they would
"have an enormously increased power over the evils of our
"times. In any case, union cannot be hurried. Men who
"have grown up in different habits, and worked in dif-
"ferent ways, cannot all at once abandon their peculiarities
"and make common cause. Some sects, indeed, might be
"joined at once; but for most the process must take time.
"The main point is to be moving in the right direction. Each
"Church should aim at simplifying its ideas, and getting to
"understand the ways of its neighbours. The way to sim-
"plicity is knowledge: and the way to union is mutual know-

"ledge. It is with these views that this journal is established. "Its founders believe that union is desirable, and to a large "extent possible; and that a wider sympathy and closer co-"operation are not far off. They hope to do much to make "the thoughts and ways of the different Churches of Christen-"dom familiar to each other, and so to foster a spirit of "genuine Catholicity. The round arch on their cover may "stand for a symbol of this idea, when it recalls the time when "Western Europe was, at least in form, one in Christ. . . . "Following the plan of aiming first at bringing nearer together "those who are already not far off, the Review has been placed "under a junta of five Special Editors, one of whom will "represent each of the five leading divisions of British "Religion: the Anglican (Dr. Farrar), the Presbyterian (Dr. "Donald Fraser), the Baptist (Dr. Clifford), the Congregational "(Dr. Mackennal), and the Methodist (Mr. Bunting). Each "will be responsible only for matter which may appear under "his own signature. The whole Review will be managed by "the General Editor, Dr. Lunn, who will be responsible for all "unsigned matter. In the case of the Anglican Church it is "not likely that any one man will be accepted as representing "sympathetically all the varying views of the great parties "which find place within its ample fold; but this want, as "well as the information to come from other great bodies— "the Roman Catholics, the Unitarians, the Society of Friends, "the Salvation Army, and others—will be supplied, partly, by "the aid of writers of their own."

II. Reply of Cardinal Manning.

"MY DEAR DR. LUNN,—I will not again refuse to send you "a few words, but it is difficult for me to do more than listen "to the voices which are reviewing 'the Churches.'

"In May, 1848, I saw and spoke for the first time with "Pius IX. He questioned me at length about the Christianity "of England, and about the multiplicity of good and charitable

"works done by Anglicans and Dissenters, ending with the "Quakers and the great prison reformation of Mrs. Fry. He "then leaned back in his chair, and said, as if to himself, "'The English do a multitude of good works: and when "men do good works God always pours out His grace. My "poor prayers are offered day by day for England.' Since "that time every year has multiplied all kinds of good works "in England. There can be no doubt that an especial power "of the Holy Ghost has breathed and is still breathing over "our people. I gladly repeat the words of Pius IX., for I "rejoice over the good works which cover the face of our "country. My daily prayer is for England, and so far as it "has been in my power I have shared your good works and "united with your peaceful and beneficent aims. In the "words which open your first number I heartily agree. You "say, 'The tendency of religion in our day is towards union.' "There has grown up in the last fifty years a vivid sense or "instinct that division is evil, and the source of evils. The "desire and prayers for the re-union of Christendom have "created movements and organisation both in the Anglican "and in the Dissenting bodies, and your REVIEW OF THE "CHURCHES is its latest and most resolute manifestation.

"When I held back from writing as one of your con-"tributors it was not from any slackness in desiring that all "our hearts may be drawn into unity, but unwilling to strike "a note out of harmony with you. You have many ways of "seeking union. We have but one. Union in good works "has indeed a constraining moral influence in bringing the "most remote men together, and charity is a way to Truth: "'If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine "whether it be of God.' This is a safe course for those who "are divided from each other. Controversy repels, but charity "unites. Your present action cannot fail to bring many minds "into closer union of goodwill.

"But this is neither our need nor method. Union is not

"unity. And unity is not the creation of human wills, but "of the Divine. It does not spring up from the earth: it "descends from heaven. S. Cyprian truly describes it as the "raiment of our Lord, 'without seam, woven *from the top* "throughout by heavenly sacraments." It is Truth that "generates Unity, and it can be recovered only by the same "principle and from the same source from which it descended "in the beginning.

"Mr. Price Hughes has quoted, he says with surprise, some "words of mine from a book on the 'Internal Mission of the "Holy Ghost.' There was no need for surprise; for these "words are only the Catholic doctrine of the universality of "Grace. And they pre-suppose the doctrine of the visible "Church, which has not only a visible body, but also an "invisible soul. The soul of the Church is as old as Abel, "and as wide as the race of mankind. It embraces every soul "of man who has lived, or at least has died, in union with God "by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Nearly thirty years "ago I published all this in answer to my friend, the late "Dr. Pusey, in a letter on 'The Workings of the Spirit in the "Church of England.' This letter has been lately reprinted "by Messrs. Burns and Oates. Thus far then I can lay a basis "on which to write and to hope with all your contributors. "We believe that the Holy Ghost breathes throughout the "world, and gathers into union with God, and to eternal life, "all those who faithfully co-operate with His light and grace. "None are responsible for dying *inculpably* out of the visible "Body of the Church. They only are culpable who knowingly "and wilfully reject its divine voice when sufficiently known to "them. But I must not go on, for you are seeking union "in agreements, and I have no will to strike a discordant note. "You say truly 'the controversies to which most of our "Churches owe their rise have lost much of their interest for "us; some of them are hardly intelligible.'

"I have two great advantages. I can hope and embrace

"you in the Soul of the Church, and I can rejoice in all, and "gladly share in many of your good works.

"May the Holy Ghost renew His own unity in Truth!"

Believe me,

My dear Dr. Lunn,

Yours very truly,

HENRY E. CARD. MANNING.

Archbishop's House,

October 30th, 1891.

III. The Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom.

"To all who believe the prophecies of the Old Testament, "and the words of our Lord and His Apostles in the New, the "present divided state of Christendom must be a matter of "perplexity, and ought to be a cause of deep sorrow and "humiliation. To many it has proved an occasion of settled "doubt or indifference, while not a few find in it a plausible "pretext for unbelief. Through our divisions the principle of "authority, embodied in S. Augustine's famous rule, *Securus* "*judicat orbis terrarum*, is seriously compromised; the con- "version of the heathen, who, after eighteen centuries, number "more than three-fourths of mankind, is almost at a standstill; "while among professing Christians mutual strife has taken the "place of mutual edification, and every country in Europe is "honeycombed with open or secret infidelity. All this is so "obvious on the face of it that it is admitted as soon as it is "stated. No sincere believer will deny in the abstract, the "disastrous results of disunion, or the duty of seeking to "promote by all available means that unity which our Lord "enjoined on His followers, and for which He thrice prayed "in His great Eucharistic intercession before His Passion. "Yet, strange to say, when they are asked to go a step further, "and bestir themselves for the attainment of so desirable an "object, the vast multitude of Christian men with one consent "begin to make excuse. Many content themselves with

"urging—what of course is true—that their first duty is "towards their own communion, and thence infer that it will "be time enough to think about the reunion of Christendom "when they have secured more unity of sentiment and action "at home. To which it is enough to reply that theological "party spirit is mainly fostered by that weakening of the "evidences of faith, which inevitably results from disunion, "and that the surest cure for internal divisions is the restora-"tion of visible unity. But the chief objection to taking any "action in the matter, which underlies all others, and is often "felt or implied when it is not put into words, is this—that it is "idle to aim at what is virtually unattainable, and the prospect "of reunion lies too far out of sight for a practical man to "waste time and trouble in twisting ropes of sand. The "answer is twofold. In the first place, that cannot be un-"attainable which has once been attained; and, after making "all allowance for the existence of some not inconsiderable "sects, especially in the East, for above a thousand years, the "principle of corporate unity was, in the main, visibly preserved "throughout Christendom, and for five centuries more through-"out the Christian West, which is now so miserably divided. "Nor can it for a moment be supposed that our Divine Lord "insisted on the paramount importance and obligation for all "time of what is in this age impossible; the unity of His "disciples was to be, as it in fact became, the witness to the "world of His mission, while their divisions have taught the "world to reject Him. In the next place, it is not true that "the proposed aim is unpracticable, or that nothing can be "done towards attaining it. That this it no sentimental want "may be inferred at once from the grave practical evils already "referred to, and on which volumes might be written, which "are the fruits of disunion. It is equally certain that each one "of us may, and in fact does, contribute his quota towards "furthering or thwarting the cause of unity. Everyone, how-"ever insignificant, exerts a certain influence, by his words,

"acts, and habitual tone, though it be within a limited sphere; "clergymen and others in a public position often exert a con- "siderable influence. And the sum total of all this personal "influence goes to make up what is called public opinion, "which, more, perhaps, in our own, than in any previous age, "constitutes the dominant power in the world, and to a certain "extent, in the Church also. How far that power shall tell for "or against reunion, depends ultimately, therefore, on the "attitude assumed towards the question by each separate in- "dividual. And let all remember, whether their opportunities of "moulding opinion be great or small, that they are responsible "to God for the use of them."

"One enormous means of power is, however, open equally "to all, of whatever age, rank, or position, in proportion to "their holiness; and that means is prayer. That Christians "should refuse to labour for an object commended to them "by the express injunction and dying prayer of their Saviour, "because they do not clearly see their way to its attainment, "is sufficiently startling, that they should neglect to pray for "it, is nothing short of an implicit avowal of unbelief, either in "the reality of His promises, or the efficacy of prayer. Are "we not exhorted to "weary" God with our importunities? "But if men say 'We can pray for this intention by ourselves, "'why should we join a Society like the 'Association for Pro- "'moting the Unity of Christendom' in order to do so?' the "reply is a very simple one. Certainly, they can pray for "unity by themselves, and they may have good reasons against "joining this or that particular Association, on which their "own consciences must decide. But they should bear in mind "that to intercede as members of a Society, united in a "common bond for a common end, is a great incentive to "regularity and earnestness in prayer; and still more, that all "the reasons for intercession apply with tenfold force to united "intercession. He who has bidden us to pray always, and not "to faint, has also told us that when two or three are agreed

"to ask anything in His name, it shall be done for them. Not "for one but for ten righteous men would God vouchsafe to "spare the guilty Sodom. Who can say what might not at "this eleventh hour be effected by the combined supplication, "not of ten, but of tens of thousands of believing Christians, "banded together in a holy league, to intercede for the city "of God, the new Jerusalem, 'which spiritually is called Sodom, "'where also,' in this her hour of trial, 'our Lord' is being "daily 'crucified'? To united prayer belongs a 'suppliant "'omnipotence,' limited only by the will of Him who is more "ready to hear than we to pray, and in pleading for the peace "and unity of His Church we know that we are asking for "what is agreeable to His holy will. If we really and earnestly "desired that blessed consummation, we should make it the "object of our definite, constant, persevering endeavours, above "all of definite, united, daily prayer. Because we have failed "to do so, and have thought in our hearts that some things "are impossible with God, He stays His hand. To us, with our "bitter controversies, our proud isolation, our rival Churches, "and countless jarring sects, the words are even now addressed, "'Ye fight and war, but ye have not, because ye ask not.' "The Redeemer taught us by His dying intercession that to "ask for unity was not to 'ask amiss.'"

Date Loaned

USE RESTRICTED TO LIBRARY ONLY			
MAY 3 '88			
USE FOR ONE MONTH			
JUN 29 '88			
USE FOR ONE MONTH			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1138